LAW REVERSIONARY INTEREST SOCIETY, LIMITED

24, LINCOLN'S INN FIELDS, W.C.

ESTABLISHED 1853.

Capital £400,000
Debentures and Debenture Stock £180,000
REVERSIONS BOUGHT. LOANS MADE THEREON.
Proposal Forms and full information may be had at the Society's Offices.
W. OSCAR NASH, F.I.A., *Actuary.*

MIDLAND RAILWAY HOTELS.

LONDON, N.W. MIDLAND GRAND (St. Pancras Station). (*Within Shilling cab fare of Gray's-inn, Inns of Court, Temple Bar, Law Courts, &c. Buses to all parts every minute. Close to King's Cross Metropolitan Ry. Station. The New Venetian Rooms are available for Public and Private Dinners, Arbitration Meetings, &c.*)
LIVERPOOL - ADELPHI - Close to Central (Midland) Station.
BRADFORD - MIDLAND - Excellent Restaurant.
LEEDS - - QUEEN'S - In Centre of Town.
DERBY - - MIDLAND - For Peak of Derbyshire.
MORECAMBE - MIDLAND - Tennis Lawn to Seashore. Golf.
HEYSHAM—HEYSHAM TOWER, nr MORECAMBE. Lovely Country. Golf.
Tariffs on Application. *Telegraphic Address "Midotel."*
Adelphi "Turtle" Soup forwarded from Adelphi Hotel, Liverpool, per quart jar 18s.; per pint jar, 9s. 6d., carriage paid. *Speciality for Invalids.*
WILLIAM TOWLE, Manager Midland Railway Hotels.

THE OLDEST & WEALTHIEST EXISTING MORTGAGE INSURANCE OFFICE.

THE LAW GUARANTEE AND TRUST SOCIETY, LIMITED.

SUBSCRIBED CAPITAL - £1,000,000. PAID-UP - £100,000.

FIDELITY GUARANTEES OF ALL KINDS. ADMINISTRATION AND LUNACY BONDS. MORTGAGE, DEBENTURE, LICENSE, AND CONTINGENCY INSURANCE. TRUSTEESHIPS FOR DEBENTURE-HOLDERS, &C.

HEAD OFFICE: 49, Chancery-lane, W.C. | CITY OFFICE: 56, Moorgate-street, E.C.

X *IMPORTANT TO SOLICITORS* X

In Drawing LEASES or MORTGAGES of
LICENSED PROPERTY

To see that the Insurance Covenants include a policy covering the risk of LOSS OR FORFEITURE OF THE LICENSE.

Suitable clauses, settled by Counsel, can be obtained on application to
THE LICENSES INSURANCE CORPORATION AND GUARANTEE FUND, LIMITED,
24, MOORGATE STREET, LONDON, E.C.
Mortgages Guaranteed on Licensed Properties promptly, without special valuation and at low rates.

LEGAL AND GENERAL LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY.

ESTABLISHED OVER HALF A CENTURY.

10, FLEET STREET, LONDON.

FREE,
SIMPLE,
THE PERFECTED SYSTEM OF LIFE ASSURANCE.
AND
SECURE.

FUNDS - - - £3,000,000. INCOME - - - £390,000.
YEARLY NEW BUSINESS - £1,000,000. BUSINESS IN FORCE - £11,700,000.

TRUSTEES.
The Right Hon. Lord HALSBURY (Lord High Chancellor of England).
The Hon. Mr. Justice KEKEWICH.
The Right Hon. Sir JAMES PARKER DEANE, Q.C., D.C.L.
WILLIAM WILLIAMS, Esq.
RICHARD PENNINGTON, Esq.

DIRECTORS.
Bacon, His Honour Judge.
Davey, The Right Hon. Lord.
Deane, The Right Hon. Sir James Parker, Q.C., D.C.L.
Ellis-Danvers, Edmund Henry, Esq.
Finch, Arthur J., Esq.
Frere, Geo. Edgar, Esq.
Garth, The Right Hon. Sir Richard, Q.C.
Healey, C. E. H. Chadwyck, Esq., Q.C.
Johnson, Charles P., Esq.
Kekewich, The Hon. Mr. Justice.
Lawrence, N. T., Esq.
Ludlow, The Right Hon. Lord.
Masterman, Henry Chauncy, Esq.
Mathew, The Hon. Mr. Justice.
Meek, A. Grant, Esq. (Devises).
Mellor, The Right Hon. John W., Q.C., M.P.
Mills, Richard, Esq.
Morrell, Frederic P., Esq. (Oxford).
Pennington, Richard, Esq.
Rowcliffe, Edward Lee, Esq.
Saltwell, Wm. Henry, Esq.
Williams, C. Reynolds, Esq.
Williams, Romer, Esq.
Williams, William, Esq.

VOL. XLII., No. 26.

The Solicitors' Journal and Reporter

LONDON, APRIL 30, 1898.

*** The Editor cannot undertake to return rejected contributions, and copies should be kept of all articles sent by writers who are not on the regular staff of the JOURNAL.

Contents.

CURRENT TOPICS 443
THE LAND TRANSFER RULES 446
THE CRIMINAL EVIDENCE BILL 447
CORRESPONDENCE 448
LEGAL NEWS 451
COURT PAPERS 453
WINDING UP NOTICES 458
BANKRUPTCY NOTICES 459

Cases Reported this Week.

In the Solicitors' Journal.

Blenkinsop v. Ogden & Co. 450
Cessford v. Dover Harbour Board 451
Ehrmann v. Bartholomew 449
Hockley Hall and Whateley Collieries and Brickworks (Lim.) 449
Horner v. Lewis 450
Leicester County Council v. Leicester Assessment Committee 450
London and North-Western Railway Co. v. Donnellan 449
Ritson, Re. Ritson v. Ritson 450
Saunders (Appellant) v. Thorney (Respondent) 451
Weekes v. The Kent, Sussex, and General Land Society (Lim.) 449

In the Weekly Reporter.

Anglo-Continental Corporation of West Australia (Limited), In re 413
Driffield Gas Co., In re 411
Gage v Bracley 415
Kaye v. Croydon Tramways Co. 405
Reg. v. Clemens and Others 416
Smith and Others (Overseers of Worthing) v. Richmond (Surveyor of Taxes) 401
Stephenson v. Garnett 410
The Municipal Elections Act, 1884, In re. Ex parte Pennington 415

CURRENT TOPICS.

WE HAVE been favoured with a copy of the draft rules under the Land Transfer Act, 1897. They are of unexpected and most formidable dimensions, including no fewer than 270 rules, besides lengthy appendices of forms and scales of charges, contained in sixty-two folio pages. It would be useless to reprint the draft, which may be altered before the rules are finally settled, but we propose, in a series of articles, to state and comment on its leading provisions with regard to the registration of title.

A REPORT issued by the Special Committee of the Incorporated Law Society on Money Lending, which has been adopted by the Council, recommends that the following suggestions be made to the Parliamentary Select Committee: (1) That the minimum limit for bills of sale should be raised from £30 to £50, and the interest be limited to 15 per cent. per annum on bills of sale to secure £100 and under, and 10 per cent. above that amount; (2) the re-enactment of the provisions in the Bills of Sale Act, 1878, that bills of sale should be attested by a solicitor, with a statement in the attestation that the effect of the bill has been explained to the grantor by the solicitor; (3) to give a borrower under a bill of sale power at any time to pay off the amount with interest up to date, together with fourteen days' interest in lieu of notice; and (4) to empower the High Court and county courts to interfere in cases of oppression or unfair dealing, and to make this relief available without unnecessary publicity.

NATURALLY one of the first matters of interest in the draft Land Transfer Rules is the scale of charges to be allowed to solicitors for their work in connection with the registration of title. For the first registration of freehold or leasehold land with a possessory title (which will, we imagine, be the ordinary proceeding), the solicitor's charge is made to vary with the value of the land. If such value does not exceed £1,000, he is to receive the munificent sum of 10s. 6d. for every £100 or part of £100, no minimum fee being prescribed. If the value exceeds £1,000, and does not exceed

£20,000, he is to receive £5 5s. for the first £1,000, and £1 1s. for every subsequent £2,000 or part of £2,000. If the value exceeds £20,000 and does not exceed £40,000, he is to receive £15 15s. for the first £20,000, and £1 1s. for every subsequent £4,000 or part of £4,000. And if the value exceeds £40,000, he is to receive £21 for the first £40,000, and £1 1s. for every subsequent £10,000 or part of £10,000, up to a maximum of £26 5s. Now let us see what the solicitor has to do for this remuneration. This is prescribed by rule 17. He is to prepare and deliver at the registry a written application, signed by him or his client, in a form given in the first schedule, either accompanied by a plan or containing particulars sufficient to enable the land to be "fully identified" on the ordnance map, and, if a particular verbal description is desired to be entered on the register, stating such description. He is also to prepare and deliver at the registry a statutory declaration by the applicant or his solicitor, in a form contained in the first schedule, stating (where made by the applicant) that the declarant is in possession or receipt of the rents and profits of land shown on the plan annexed as an exhibit or described in the verbal description to be entered on the register, and that he is entitled thereto in fee simple for his own benefit, or otherwise, as the case may be; and that the value of the land does not, to the best of his belief, exceed a sum to be specified. And if the application is for registration in the name of a nominee, or is made by a purchaser, the consent in writing of the nominee, or of the vendor or his solicitor, must be prepared by the solicitor and left with the application. If any deed or document of title is delivered with the application, it will be marked with notice of the registration and the number of the title, and if returned to the applicant, a copy or abstract of it for filing must be prepared by the solicitor and furnished to the office if required. Then the entries and plan will have to be settled and the land certificate prepared by the office and considered by the solicitor, and either handed to the applicant or deposited at the registry. Here we have, in the simplest case, the preparation by the solicitor of an application, probably of a plan, and of a statutory declaration, probably with a plan exhibited thereto, and of a consent by the vendor. Then there are attendances to deliver these documents at the office, attendances to settle same, and attendance to receive the land certificate. In matters of difficulty no forecast can be made of the time and trouble which may be involved. For this a purchaser's solicitor, on a purchase for £1,000, is to receive £5 5s.

On the first registration of land with an absolute or qualified title, the remuneration of the solicitor is also to vary with the value of the land. For the first £1,000 in value he is to receive £1 10s. per £100, for the second and third £1,000, £1 per £100; for the fourth and each subsequent £1,000 up to £10,000, 10s. per £100; and for each subsequent £1,000 up to £100,000, 5s. per £1,000. There is to be a minimum charge of £3 where the value is under £100, and of £5 where the value is £100 or over, and fractions of £100 under £50 are to be reckoned as £50, and fractions of £100 above £50 are to be reckoned as £100. The work to be done by the solicitor in the case of registration with an absolute or qualified title will, we assume, be that now done by the purchaser's solicitor, except preparation of the conveyance, but *plus* all the requirements of the rules, which are much too lengthy and complicated to be summarized here; and for a purchase of £1,000 he will receive the present scale remuneration of £15; while on a purchase for £5,000 he will receive the scale fee of £45 now payable to the purchaser's solicitor. That is to say, the solicitor is in these cases to receive nothing for the extra work involved in obtaining registration; the object being, no doubt, to enable the office to say to purchasers "You can get an absolute or qualified title for a less fee to your solicitor than you will have to pay if you take a conveyance in the usual way, and register with a possessory title." And (see rule 261 (*d*)) this remuneration is not to apply at all "when the title has been deduced or investigated by such solicitor on the occasion of a recent sale, purchase, or mortgage." In the case of completed transfers, charges, exchanges, and partitions of land (whether registered with an absolute, qualified, or possessory title), or of a registered charge *where no title outside the register is investigated*, the remuneration of the solicitor is to be that prescribed for the first registration of land. So that, of course, when property is once registered with an absolute or qualified title, the solicitor's fees on any subsequent dealing therewith are cut down to the bare sums mentioned above in relation to first registration. There are many other matters to be noticed in the rules relating to solicitor's remuneration, but the above may suffice for the present week.

At the Old Bailey this week a point of law on the construction of the Criminal Law Amendment Act, 1885, was raised, which is new and of very great importance. Section 3 (2) of that Act provides that any person who "by false pretences or false representations procures any woman or girl, not being a common prostitute or of known immoral character, to have any unlawful carnal connection" shall be guilty of a misdemeanour. The prisoner in the case referred to was indicted under this section for having procured a certain woman to have unlawful connection with himself by falsely pretending that he was an unmarried man, and that he was able and willing to marry her. A motion was made to quash the indictment on the grounds that, on the face of it, no offence was disclosed, and in support of the motion it was argued that "procure" in the section means "induce to have connection with some person other than the person procuring." In support of the indictment, it was said that the word merely means to obtain, cause, or bring about, and that the section must be interpreted literally, giving to the word "procure" its ordinary meaning. The dictionaries state that the word has a secondary signification—that is, to obtain for the purpose of gratifying another's lust, and is allied in meaning with "pimp" and "pander." The word "procuress" has a well-established meaning, and is seldom, if ever, used in any but this evil sense. It seems highly probable also, when we remember the nature of the agitation out of which the Act grew, that Parliament had this secondary sense in mind in each place in which the word "procure" is used. On the other hand, section 2 (1) provides that any person shall be guilty of a misdemeanour who "procures any girl or woman under twenty-one years of age . . . to have unlawful carnal connection . . . *with any other person or persons*," while in section 3 these last words are omitted. Further, there is a decision of the Court of Crown Cases Reserved in the case of *Reg.* v. *Jones* (44 W. R. 110; 1896, 1 Q. B. 4), on section 11, which is entitled to consideration. Section 11 provides that any male person shall be guilty of a misdemeanour who "procures the commission by any male person of any act of gross indecency with another male person." Here the court held that "another male person" may be the person who procures; and the Recorder of London on the strength of this decision felt himself bound to uphold the indictment in the recent case. He could hardly do otherwise under the circumstances, but probably a case may yet be stated for the superior court. The decision in *Reg.* v. *Jones* on this point is, however, by no means satisfactory, as no counsel appeared in the case, and it is to be hoped that this important point will be authoritatively settled. If it becomes generally known that any man who seduces a woman under false pretences is liable to be indicted and to be imprisoned for two years, there will probably be a large number of prosecutions for the offence, as it is a very common one. We are far from saying that such persons do not deserve punishment, but at the same time it is to be remembered that when once it is recognized that a man who seduces a woman, say under false pretences as to his means, may be punished criminally, a very powerful weapon will be put in the hands of unscrupulous and designing women.

The prominent feature in the Queen's Proclamation of Neutrality is the recital of the rules annexed to Article VI. of the Treaty of Washington and of the Foreign Enlistment Act, 1870. The Act is a matter of municipal provision, and lays down the principles for preserving neutrality which the Government of Great Britain will enforce against British subjects. The rules are a matter of international provision, and declare the principles which ought to secure the observance of neutrality by either Great Britain or the United States in cases where the other party is engaged in hostilities. In the matter of munici-

pal regulation the United States have, historically speaking, the advantage. A hundred years ago they attempted to put a stop to the practice of European nations enlisting men and equipping vessels in their ports for the purposes of European war, and by an Act of Congress of 1794, revised and re-enacted in 1818, it was declared to be a misdemeanour for any citizen of the United States within the territory or jurisdiction thereof to enlist soldiers or seamen, or fit out any ship, or augment the force of any ship of war, for the purpose of hostilities with a state with which the United States were at peace. But the declaring of these principles was a different matter from securing their observance, and in the first half of the century Spain had frequent occasion to complain of the fitting out in the United States of privateers and expeditions aimed at her commerce or territory. The most noticeable instance was the expedition fitted out by LOPEZ against Cuba in 1849, with the object of annexing the island to the United States. LOPEZ was twice prosecuted by the United States Government, but no conviction was secured, and his punishment was left for the Spaniards, who executed him at Havana on the failure of his second expedition in 1851. In England the earliest authority upon foreign enlistment seems to be the case referred to in Fortescue's Reports, p. 388. In 1721 the judges were ordered to attend the House of Lords to advise upon a complaint made by Sweden that ships had been built and sold to the Czar; and they gave it as their opinion that the king had by law no power to prohibit the building of ships of war or of great force for foreigners in any of his Majesty's dominions. Acts for the purpose of preventing the enlistment of British subjects for service abroad were passed in 1736 (9 Geo. 2, c. 30) and 1756 (29 Geo. 2, c. 17), but the first proper Foreign Enlistment Act was 59 Geo. 3, c. 69, which followed by a year the present statute of the United States. Its provisions have been carried further by the Act of 1870, and in particular an embargo is now placed upon the building of ships in this country for the use of foreign belligerents. Thus section 8 provides that it is an offence against the Act for any person within the Queen's dominions, without the licence of the Queen, to build or agree to build or cause to be built any ship, with intent or knowledge or having reasonable cause to believe that she will be employed in the military or naval service of any foreign state at war with any friendly state.

AS BETWEEN Great Britain and the United States the conduct of the former on the present occasion is governed by the rules annexed to Article VI. of the Treaty of Washington, which, briefly stated, provides as follows: A neutral Government is bound (1) to use due diligence to prevent the fitting out within its jurisdiction of any vessel which it has reasonable ground to believe is intended to carry on war against a Power with which it is at peace, and also to use the like diligence to prevent the departure from its jurisdiction of any vessel intended to carry on war, such vessel having been specially adapted, in whole or in part, within such jurisdiction, to warlike use; (2) not to permit either belligerent to make use of its ports or waters as the base of naval operations against the other, or for the purpose of recruiting or of renewing or augmenting military supplies; and (3) to exercise due diligence in its own ports and waters, and as to all persons within its jurisdiction, to prevent any violation of the foregoing duties. These rules form a curious instance of *ex post facto* legislation. They were formulated by the United States with a view to stating the principles of international law on the subject of foreign enlistment at the date when *The Alabama* was allowed to be equipped in England. The British Government refused to admit that the rules were any part of international law, but in order to evince its desire of strengthening the friendly relations between the two countries, and of making satisfactory provision for the future, it was agreed that the Alabama Arbitration should be conducted on the assumption that the rules had been previously in existence, and also that the two countries should observe the rules as between themselves in the future. The rules themselves are expressed in general terms, and the practical application of them, so far as concerns the use by foreign belligerents of the ports and harbours of the British Empire, is contained in the regulations which have been issued by the Home Secretary, and which confine within narrow limits the time during which any belligerent ship can remain in a British port and the supplies which she can obtain, and also require an interval of twenty-four hours to elapse between the departure from the same port of ships of opposite sides. It is interesting to note that the United States, in whose favour the rules were originally conceded, have had to suffer for them at the outset of the war by the probably permanent detention in Falmouth Harbour of the torpedo-boat *Somers*.

THE QUESTION whether or not the Preferential Payments in Bankruptcy Amendment Act, 1897, is retrospective in its operation, came before the courts for decision in two different cases last week. Section 2 of the Act, in effect, gives priority in the winding up of any company under the Companies Acts to the debts mentioned in section 1 of the Preferential Payments in Bankruptcy Act, 1888, over the claims of holders of debentures or debenture stock under any floating charge created by such company, but only in so far as the assets of the company available for the payment of all general creditors may be insufficient to meet such debts. The debts specified in section 1 of the Act of 1888 comprise parochial and local rates, taxes, land tax, property or income tax, the wages or salary of any clerk or servant, and of any labourer or workman, due from the bankrupt or company in respect of certain periods prior to the bankruptcy or winding up. The Act of 1897 received the Royal Assent on the 15th of July, 1897, but it does not contain any provision fixing a date on which it is to come into operation. In each of the cases above referred to the winding-up had commenced, and the debenture-holders' action had been brought, before the 15th of July, 1897. The first case was that of *Re The Waverley Typewriter (Limited)*, which came before WRIGHT, J., in the Companies (Winding-up) Court, upon a claim by some workmen, to whom the company was indebted, for the preferential payment of moneys due to them in respect of wages. WRIGHT, J., decided that the Act of 1897 was not retrospective in operation, and disallowed the claim. In his opinion the Act of 1897 formed part of the Act of 1888, which in terms only applied where a winding up had commenced after the commencement of the Act. In the subsequent case of *Weekes v. The Kent, Sussex, and General Land Society (Limited)* (reported elsewhere) before KEKEWICH, J., the Commissioners of Inland Revenue raised a claim for the preferential payment of a year's income tax due to them from the company. Counsel for the company referred to *Re The Waverley Typewriter (Limited)*, and KEKEWICH, J., without expressing any opinion on the point, followed the decision of WRIGHT, J., and held that as the Act was not retrospective, that the claim failed, and that the Crown must pay the costs of the summons. In deciding as he did, WRIGHT, J., followed the principle discussed by Sir GEORGE JESSEL in *Re Joseph Suche & Co.* (24 W. R. 184)—namely, that when the Legislature alters the rights of parties by taking away or conferring any right of action, its enactments, unless in express terms they apply to pending actions, do not affect these rights, except in so far as such enactments relate merely to procedure. By the Act of 1897, which did not come within the exception, the Legislature had interfered with the rights of debenture-holders if they had not taken steps to realize their securities before the passing of the Act, but it had not gone so far as to interfere with their rights when they had already taken those steps.

THE HEAVY loss usually inflicted upon the owner of a public-house by the refusal of justices to renew its licence makes every decision of the courts as to the powers of justices to so refuse of peculiar interest. The latest of such cases is *Baxter* v. *Leche* (*ante*, p. 430), which was a special case stated by the Court of Quarter Sessions for Cheshire, on an appeal against the refusal of justices at an adjourned annual licensing meeting to renew the appellant's licence. The general annual meeting was held on the 31st of August, and no notice was given to the appellant requiring her to attend, or of any intention to oppose the renewal. At the meeting, however, some of the justices of themselves started an objection to the renewal, and accordingly, by

their instructions, their clerk, on the 3rd of September, served the appellant with a notice, "on behalf of the licensing justices," requiring her to attend at the adjourned meeting to be held on the 28th of September. No other objection was made at the annual meeting. On the 20th of September certain persons, not justices, served upon the appellant notice of their intention to oppose the renewal of her licence on certain grounds stated therein. The appellant and her solicitor appeared at the adjourned meeting and objected to the validity of the notices. The renewal, however, was refused; the refusal was upheld by quarter sessions, and the Divisional Court has confirmed the decision of quarter sessions. Now, section 42 of the Licensing Act, 1872, after providing that a licence-holder need not attend in person at the annual meeting unless he is required, and that no objection shall be entertained unless written notice thereof has been served upon him not less than seven days before the meeting, contains a proviso "that the licensing justices may, notwithstanding that no notice has been given, on an objection being made, adjourn the granting of any licence to a future day, and require the attendance of the holder of the licence on such day, when the case will be heard and the objection considered, as if notice hereinbefore prescribed had been given." It was held in *Daykin* v. *Parker* (42 W. R. 625; 1894, 2 Q. B. 273) that an objection made openly at the annual licensing meeting is a good "objection made," although the nature of the objection is not stated at the time by the objector, and that, upon such an objection being made, the justices have power to postpone the consideration of an objection to an adjourned meeting. Still it seems clear that the objection considered at the adjourned meeting was the objection raised at the annual meeting, and that the objector was the same person. It appears also that the Act contemplates only "the objection" made at the annual meeting being considered at the adjourned meeting. In *Baxter* v. *Leche*, however, the notice of the 20th of September seems to have been given by persons who had raised no objection at all at the annual meeting. If, therefore, this decision stands, the fact that if, for an objection started by one of their own body, justices adjourn an application for a renewal, the case is opened to the whole world, and anyone who serves due notice before the adjourned meeting has power to oppose the renewal. Leave to appeal was given by the Divisional Court, and, as this is a serious matter for licence-holders, probably the question will be heard of again.

THE LAND TRANSFER RULES.

The draft of the rules made under the Land Transfer Acts, 1875 and 1897, has been issued, but the publishers have, we understand, been directed for the present not to issue any further copies to the public. This direction, we apprehend, has been probably given with a view to the correction of certain clerical and other errors, which may have been discovered in the draft. Our subsequent remarks are consequently subject to such modification as may result from the alteration of the draft now before us.

There are 270 rules and two schedules; the first schedule containing sixty forms, and the second the provisions respecting the remuneration of solicitors; the whole draft occupying sixty-two pages of folio. When we consider that the Act of 1875 contains 127 sections, which cover 32 pages in the Law Reports, and that the Act of 1897 contains 26 sections and covers 15 pages in the Law Reports, we may be able to form some slight conception of the vast mass of statutory provisions which have been thought necessary in order to constitute a system of registration of title.

Within the very short time at our disposal since the draft was received, it is impossible to form a proper judgment of the labours of the Rule Committee, but it is hoped that the following criticisms may be of some service, more particularly as the draft does not appear to have been finally settled. They must be taken as first impressions only.

(1) *Tenant by the curtesy.*—By rule 7 it is provided that the Charges Register shall contain incumbrances, including notices of estates by the curtesy. Rule 161 provides that an application to register the estate by the curtesy shall be in form 44 in the First Schedule. Though it may have been right in 1875 to provide (see section 52) that an estate by the curtesy should be registered as an incumbrance, this in effect appears to have been repealed by the Act of 1897, s. 6 (1) (10), under which a tenant for life within the meaning of the Settled Land Acts may at his option register settled land in his own name. Now, under the Settled Land Act, 1882, s. 58 (viii.), a tenant by the curtesy who is in possession or entitled to the receipt of the rents and profits (*Bates* v. *Kesterton*, 1896, 1 Ch. 159, 164) is a person having the powers of a tenant for life. It is almost inconceivable to suppose that a person having powers under section 58 is not a tenant for life within the Land Transfer Act, 1897, s. 6, hence it follows that an estate by the curtesy should at any rate only be capable of registration as an incumbrance where it is not an estate in possession.

(2) *Right of consolidation.*—Rule 112 is as follows:

"Where a charge, whether affecting the whole or a part of the land comprised in a title, reserves the right to consolidate, it shall not on that account be registered against any other land than that expressly described in it." In so far as this rule recognizes that the former practice at the Land Registry, which prevented any such right being reserved, is to be discontinued, the rule is in the right direction, but it seems to throw considerable doubt as to the manner in which the right of consolidation is to be enforced. It is conceived that the intention is that the mere reservation of the right is not to operate unless something is done by the chargee to exercise the right, but this we submit is by no means clear.

(3) *Registration of executor without probate.*—Under rule 126, where, on the grant of probate to A., the right to come in and prove is reserved to B, then, if B. states in writing that he has accepted the executorship and desires to be registered, the registrar is bound to register him as joint proprietor with A. before B. has proved the will. No doubt such an extraordinary provision must have engaged the serious attention of the Rule Committee, but at first sight it is not obvious what benefit can accrue by it, while serious inconvenience might be caused if B. were to die before he took out probate. At any rate, probate should be produced to the registrar within a limited time from the application for registration.

(4) *Cross-references.*—Throughout the rules we find the dubious practice of referring to other rules by number has been adopted. In cases of hurried alterations this may lead to considerable error, and even now it will be observed that in rules 246 and 247 rule 151 has been referred to when clearly 152 is intended.

(5) *Value of registered land.*—In form No. 1 and in other forms it will be observed that a declaration as to the value of the land is to be made; presumably in order to enable the *ad valorem* fees to be assessed and to afford information to persons lending on the security of the land. It appears, however, to have escaped attention that the land may be subject or not to incumbrances; at any rate it should be stated whether in the valuation regard is to be had to incumbrances, and further, it might be well to define the classes of incumbrances, if any, which ought to be taken into account.

(6) *Restriction where tenant for life is registered as proprietor, and there are trustees of the settlement.*—The restriction contained in form 5 in the First Schedule appears to go too far, inasmuch as it would prevent any mortgage from being made under the Settled Land Act, 1882, s. 5, or the Settled Land Act, 1890, s. 11, without an order. It may be that the Land Transfer Acts do in some respects fetter the powers conferred by the Settled Land Acts, and in so far as this is the case we think that constitutes a serious objection to the machinery of the first-named Acts. In the present case, however, we submit that the restriction is unnecessarily onerous. Thus if it were provided that—

> Until further order, no transfer or charge of the land is to be made unless the consideration money is paid to A. B. of &c., and C. D. of &c. [*the trustees of the settlement*] or into court

—the effect of the Settled Land Acts would be preserved and ample protection would be secured that no improper disposition was made.

Where the tenant for life has a power to charge for his own benefit an exception might be introduced into the restriction,

though there would not be much harm if in this case the money was paid in the first instance to the trustees, who would be bound to pay it over to the tenant for life.

(7) *Transfers to the uses of a settlement.*—In forms 15 and 17 it will be observed that it is contemplated that where registered land is conveyed to the uses of a settlement, the Settled Land Act trustees may be registered as proprietors. Now, we submit that this is clearly improper. The Settled Land Act trustees as such have no power of sale, though trustees with a power of sale are trustees for the purposes of the Acts. If any rule made under the Land Transfer Acts can be *ultra vires*, we submit that this is, for on reference to the Land Transfer Act, 1897, s. 6 (1), it will be found that although the tenant for life may at his option register the land in his own name or in the names of trustees with a power of sale, he has no power to register it in the names of trustees for the purposes of the Acts unless they have a power of sale. It is true that the trustees have during the minority of a tenant for life in possession a power to sell the land on his behalf, but to this extent only are they trustees with a power of sale. We submit, then, that forms 15 and 17 should be made to apply to trustees with a power of sale, which would include trustees for the purposes of the Act during a minority.

We may, perhaps, without disrespect, be permitted to congratulate the very able committee on the success which, on further perusal of the rules, we conceive it will be generally admitted they have attained. The attention to detail, which is one of the most favourable features of the rules, must, however, of necessity give rise to many mistakes.

THE CRIMINAL EVIDENCE BILL.

The Criminal Evidence Bill has been read a second time in the House of Commons by a majority of 229 to 80. Ordinarily this would be a sufficient indication that the weight of opinion is overwhelmingly in favour of the proposed change, but it is to be noticed that a year ago the numbers were 210 to 41, and that the present debate produced a series of strongly adverse speeches. It was wound up by an appeal from Mr. Morley that the Bill, if read a second time, should be referred to a select committee, and it may be taken for granted that if the request were acceded to there would be an end of the measure for this year.

But though there is on the present occasion a greater show of opposition to the admission of the competency of prisoners as witnesses than formerly, the actual arguments advanced against the Bill have not increased in cogency. The circumstance of most importance—to judge from the frequent references to it—is that Mr. Justice Hawkins is alleged to have changed his view in the course of the past year, and, according to Mr. Atherley-Jones, he has come to a positive conclusion that the measure would be detrimental to the interests of justice. And Mr. Lyttelton quoted from a written opinion of Lord Justice Collins, in which that learned judge stated as his chief objection to the proposed change that he felt certain it would greatly alter the present relations between the judge and the prisoner. "It seems to me," he wrote, "inevitable that, if it should become the practice for the prisoner to give evidence in every case, the judge will in most cases have to put questions in the nature of cross-examination himself. He has to do so now very frequently in cases under the Criminal Law Amendment Act. Counsel who conduct ordinary prosecutions are frequently inexperienced, and a crucial question often has to be put by the judge. If this becomes the ordinary practice, as I think it must if the proposed change is made, it must sap the prisoner's confidence in the absolute impartiality of the judge, which is so valuable a feature in our present system. It cannot but tend to alter the attitude of the judge himself actually and apparently; and I should regard this as a great public mischief and deprecate any change which might make it possible unless I feel sure that the certain benefits would more than compensate." Opinions such as these are, of course, entitled to every respect, and it may be that experts in the administration of the criminal law are not so unanimous on the subject as has sometimes been represented. It is certain, however, that there is no lack of eminent authorities who have no such mistrust of the proposed change, and for practical purposes the matter has to be decided not by balancing against each other the views of individual judges or lawyers, but by broad considerations of what course is most calculated to further the interests of justice.

The most noteworthy statute under which the testimony of prisoners is at present admitted is the Criminal Law Amendment Act, 1885, and the argument is a perfectly fair one that either the competency of prisoners must be made universal or abolished. Much is said by the opponents of the Bill about securing respect for the administration of the law and upholding the high standard to which it has attained. But there can be no respect for a system of law which is inherently absurd, and a law which makes the evidence of a prisoner admissible or not according to the form in which the indictment is drawn, is obviously open to this charge. The resistance to the Bill would have more substance had there ever been an outcry for the repeal of the evidence clause (section 20) of the Act of 1885. The operation of the Act has, indeed, not been allowed to go without question. Sir Herbert Stephen has said that twelve years' observation of its working has convinced him that an innocent person is not less but more likely to be convicted if he can be heard as a witness for himself than if he cannot, and he has put this opinion in concrete form by alleging that upon the Northern Circuit three or four innocent persons are on an average convicted every year because they have given evidence, when they would have been acquitted if they had been incompetent as witnesses. The Attorney-General replies that the Home Office knows nothing of any such cases; and he asserted in the debate that, if they had existed, they would certainly have been brought to the notice of the department by the prisoner or his friends, an assertion which drew from Mr. Healy the fair retort that prisoners who had been convicted on their own evidence were not likely to make this circumstance the ground of an application to the Home Office. But the discussion is profitless. The significant fact is that the system introduced by the Criminal Law Amendment Act has been for a considerable time in operation and has produced no general protest on the part of the judges who have to administer it. The Attorney-General referred with some effect to the similar procedure under the Explosives Act, 1883, and to a case under it within his own experience where one of several prisoners was able to shew by giving evidence himself that he was the dupe of the other prisoners, with the result that he obtained an acquittal. The above and other similar enactments it would be very difficult to repeal, and yet, while they remain unrepealed, it is still more difficult to continue the exclusion of the evidence of prisoners in cases outside them.

The strength of the case for the opposition to the Bill lies in the fear that the giving of evidence will expose innocent prisoners who are uneducated men or who have a bad record to positive disadvantage. But the mode in which the objection is stated does no great credit to the present practices of courts of justice. The House, said Mr. Lyttelton, was legislating "for the poor, the miserable, the ignorant, the confused, almost the dumb, who were driven into a criminal court, and, who, probably for the first time in their lives, endeavoured to string together a few sentences against more or less skilled opponents." With this must be taken the assertion of another opponent of the Bill that prosecuting counsel of the present day have forgotten their true function, and instead of conducting the prosecution in a semi-judicial capacity, bend their energies to obtaining a verdict. But if these remarks represent truly the atmosphere of a court of justice the character for impartiality and fair play which the opponents of the Bill are so anxious to maintain has already ceased to exist. We greatly doubt, however, whether the conflict between prosecuting counsel and prisoner, when the prisoner goes into the witness-box, will have the disastrous result that has been predicted. An accused person may tell lies and may thus shake his own credit and secure his conviction. But this will be because he has some ulterior end in view, and not because he is unable to tell his story. He may, if very ignorant or nervous, have difficulty in telling a connected story, but English judges would not deserve the credit for patience, fairness, and

common sense universally accorded to them if they could not secure that the prisoner shall convey to the jury the facts as he intends them to be presented. The prisoner knows the facts, and, if he is innocent, his desire is to tell the facts truthfully. With the assistance of the judge there is no reason why even the most uneducated prisoner should not be able to do so. To represent that the judge will allow him to be driven by the prosecuting counsel into untruths is to depreciate the influence of the judge and to exaggerate the importance of cross-examination. The weapon of cross-examination, as Sir ROBERT REID well said, falls flat and useless against a truthful witness. Honesty entirely blunts the edge of it.

There is, indeed, no reason to suppose that the admission of the testimony of prisoners will so far alter the atmosphere of an English court of justice as to make an ignorant prisoner an easy prey for the prosecuting counsel or to turn the judge into an adversary. And if judge and counsel so far forgot their proper attitude to the prisoner, account would still have to be taken of the jury, who would resent any attempt to convert the examination of the prisoner into an engine of oppression. A more serious question arises upon the extent to which the cross-examination of the prisoner is to be admitted. Is it to be confined to the charge made against the prisoner, or is he to be subject to the ordinary rule governing the cross-examination of a witness as to credit and to be liable to have his past life with any previous convictions on similar charges brought up against him? Sir HERBERT STEPHEN, in his "Prisoners on Oath," has given good reason, if the evidence of prisoners is to be permitted, for restricting the power of cross-examination to the circumstances of the charge on which the prisoner is being tried. When the prisoner is in the witness-box the two principles that, as prisoner, he is entitled to have all extraneous matter excluded, and that, as witness, he is liable to be questioned as to his antecedents are necessarily at variance; and the more important principle to maintain is the former. By the fact of his being under arrest the credit of the prisoner is already to some extent discounted; he is—to use Mr. CARSON'S phrase—a tarnished witness; and the jury can estimate his evidence at his proper value without having the whole story of his past misdeeds before them. On the other hand, it is essential that they should decide the immediate charge on the relevant evidence, and should not be influenced by considerations of probability drawn from previous convictions. This accordingly is what the Bill proposes. The prisoner cannot be cross-examined with a view to shewing that he has been previously convicted or is of bad character, unless the previous conviction would be admissible evidence of the offence for which he is being tried, or he has himself given evidence of good character, or he has given evidence against any other person charged with the same offence. In this last case he is, as against such other person, merely a witness, and is under an ordinary witness's liability. The Bill carries out as closely as possible the principle stated by the Attorney-General in his speech, that, according to the law of England, the offence for which a man is tried is the offence with which he is being charged, and not any other offence.

Doubtless among the profession the proposed change is viewed with a certain measure of distrust. This found expression during the debate in the speeches of Mr. PICKERSGILL, Mr. LYTTELTON, Mr. ATHERLEY-JONES, Mr. CARSON, and others. The gist of the objections, as we have already stated, is that uneducated prisoners will make bad witnesses, and that judges and prosecuting counsel will assume a hostile attitude, with the result that the character of courts of justice will be lowered. These fears are repudiated by Sir RICHARD WEBSTER, Sir ROBERT REID, Sir EDWARD CLARKE, and Mr. BUCKNILL, with whom the advocacy of the Bill rested, and we apprehend that they are without foundation. A criminal trial is not in all respects analogous to a civil trial, but in each it is the object of the court to get at the truth. It is only recently that in civil trials the parties have been held competent to give evidence, and so far from the interests of justice being thereby prejudiced the contrary has happened. To exclude the parties would now be treated as a manifest absurdity. It may be anticipated that the impending change in the conduct of criminal trials will be followed by a corresponding change of feeling.

CORRESPONDENCE.

MR. WARR'S BILL FOR EXEMPTING GRADUATES FROM THE FINAL EXAMINATION.

[*To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal.*]

Sir,—If the object of this Bill is to attract university men to the ranks of our profession, and so raise its tone, I venture to suggest what I think would be a far more effective method of attaining the latter object—namely, to procure legislation to put a check on the admission of the "ten years' man," or, in other words, to compel him to pass his preliminary before allowing him to be articled. It is the presence in our midst of the man who is unable to get through an examination which no educated gentleman would at any time of his life have difficulty in passing, that tells against us. In London and in large provincial towns I fancy he is not so much noticed, but in the average-sized country towns he is very much in evidence, and however efficient his work, however accurate his technical knowledge, his social position is not what that of a member of our honourable profession should be.

My view of Mr. Warr's Bill, based on my personal experience, is, that it will work more harm than good. I worked hard for my university degree, and when I passed my examination I felt I had learnt something of the theory of many branches of law; but I should be extremely sorry to have missed the compulsory reading for the Solicitors' Final, assisted and exemplified as it was by the practical work seen in the office and the courts; and I feel to this day that it was time well spent.

I thoroughly agree with the correspondent whose letter you quote, that the law examinations at the universities cannot be conducted on other than theoretical lines, and ought not to be, either. LL.B.

April 27.

RE BROOKE AND TREMLIN'S CONTRACT.

[*To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal.*]

Sir,—Referring to your remarks on the judgment of Kekewich, J., in *Re Brooke and Tremlin's Contract*, contained in your issue of the 9th of April, as to a married woman being able to convey a mortgaged freehold property of which she is seised by reason of the mortgage money advanced by her having formed part of her separate estate, the crucial point which has to be dealt with in the majority of cases in which the point is raised in actual practice seems to be left untouched. To enable a married woman to convey such mortgaged property, it appears to me that the first essential is that the moneys advanced by her on the mortgage were in fact her separate property, and not the moneys of her husband; and in most of the cases which have come before my personal notice the proof of this has been wanting.

It is a common practice for such mortgages to be prepared without the husband being joined in the mortgage deed for the purpose of his acknowledging that the mortgage money does not belong to him, but is the separate estate of his wife. Now take the instance of a mortgage to a married woman, who advances the mortgage money out of moneys belonging to her husband, either with or without his knowledge, and the husband does not join in the deed for this purpose, what is the result then? This was the actual state of things in a case in which I was recently concerned. The married woman had, in fact, no money of her own. Her husband had left her, and she had possessed herself of his money, a part of which she had advanced on the mortgage. There was a statement in the mortgage deed that the money advanced was the separate property of the wife, but this statement did not make it so. It was well known that the contrary was the fact. Is it contended, then, that the Married Women's Property Act would vest the mortgaged property in her in such a case, so as to enable her to deal with it, as a *feme sole*?

The only advisable way out of the difficulty, so as to make the title clear in the hands of a purchaser from her, appears to me to be that the husband should be joined in the mortgage deed, or in the deed of reconveyance or the conveyance of the mortgaged property to a purchaser, in order to give the acknowledgment above mentioned. J. T. KAY.

West Hartlepool, April 22.

Lord Esher, endeavouring apparently to satisfy himself that a place is not a place when it happens to be a betting-ring, has, says the *St. James's Gazette*, had varied experiences. Not long ago the crowd at Sandown received him with cheers; last week an obscure member of it picked his pocket at the Old Berkeley Hunt Steeplechases. His lordship does not appear to have been able to collar and convict the culprit with the promptitude shown in similar circumstances by Lord Russell at Epsom, a few years before he became Lord Chief Justice. Consequently, he seems to have lost his watch for ever.

CASES OF THE WEEK.

Court of Appeal.

LONDON AND NORTH-WESTERN RAILWAY CO. *v.* DONNELLAN.
No. 1. 25th April.

RAILWAY—RATES AND CHARGES—SIDING RENT—"DIFFERENCE" TO BE DETERMINED BY AN ARBITRATOR—JURISDICTION OF COURT—LONDON AND NORTH-WESTERN RAILWAY CO. (RATES AND CHARGES) ORDER CONFIRMATION ACT, 1891 (54 & 55 VICT. c. CCXXI.), SCHEDULE TO ORDER, s. 5 (IV.).

Appeal from the judgment of a Divisional Court (Wright and Darling, JJ.), reversing a decision of the deputy county court judge at Crewe. The action was brought to recover siding rent. In January, 1895, the plaintiffs issued a notice to all their customers, including the defendant, stating that a charge would be made for the accommodation of trucks, when standing on the company's sidings for more than four days, and evidence was given that a charge of 6d. a truck per day beyond the four days was made all over the company's system. The defendant had always refused *in toto* to pay the charge, telling the company's servants that it was exorbitant and unjust, four days being too few for unloading. In an action to recover this charge for trucks belonging to the defendant which remained on the company's sidings for more than four days, the defendant set up as a defence that the county court judge had no jurisdiction to entertain the action because there was a "difference" arising under section 5 of the schedule to the provisional order scheduled to the London and North-Western Railway Co. (Rates and Charges) Order Confirmation Act, 1891, which must be referred to an arbitrator appointed by the Board of Trade. That section provides that "the company may charge for the services hereunder mentioned, or any of them, when rendered to a trader at his request or for his convenience, a reasonable sum by way of addition to the tonnage rate. Any difference arising under this section shall be determined by an arbitrator to be appointed by the Board of Trade at the instance of either party. Provided that where, before any service is rendered to a trader, he has given notice in writing to the company that he does not require it, the service shall not be deemed to have been rendered at the trader's request or for his convenience. . . . (iv.) The detention of trucks, or the use or occupation of any accommodation before or after conveyance beyond such period as shall be reasonably necessary for enabling the company to deal with the merchandise as carriers thereof, or the consignor or consignee to give or take delivery thereof." The county court judge held that he had no jurisdiction and gave judgment for the defendant. The Divisional Court held that the words of section 5, "any difference arising under this Act," referred to a difference as to the reasonableness of the amount of the charge only, and that, as in this case the defendant disputed the charge *in toto*, this was not a "difference" within the meaning of section 5, and that therefore the county court judge had jurisdiction. They accordingly gave judgment for the plaintiff for the amount claimed. The defendant appealed and contended that any difference which arose as to this charge was a "difference" within section 5, and must be referred to arbitration. *Midland Railway Co.* v. *Haigh* (13 Times L. R. 135), and some unreported decisions of the Divisional Court were referred to.

THE COURT (A. L. SMITH and CHITTY, L.JJ.) allowed the appeal.

A. L. SMITH, L.J., said that in his opinion the Legislature had enacted that as regards matters within sections 5, 6, 7, and 8 of the Provisional Order disputes should be settled by an arbitrator appointed by the Board of Trade and not be taken into court. In several cases which had been referred to Wright J. seemed to think—and Mathew and Wills, JJ., took the same view—that the reasonableness of the amount of the charge was the only matter for arbitration under section 5. He was unable to agree with that view. "Any difference arising under this section" was not limited to the reasonableness of the amount of the charge. The words included any difference arising under any of the sub-sections of section 5. Under sub-section (i.) the arbitrator might have to determine, if it was in dispute, whether the sidings belonged to the company or not; so under sub-section (ii.) the arbitrator might have to determine whether the services were rendered outside the terminal station; and in sub-section (iv.) in finding out what was a reasonable charge the arbitrator might have to determine what was the period reasonably necessary to take delivery. The arbitrator must settle the whole dispute, and not merely fix the amount, leaving the rest to the court. In the present case there was a "difference arising under" section 5, and the county court judge was right.

CHITTY, L.J., concurred. There were no words in section 5 limiting the "difference" to the reasonableness of the amount of the charge. It included all that was material with reference to the various sub-sections—that is to say, all matters which were material to the decision of the difference, whatever that difference might be, arising under the section. The Legislature had thought that this was a class of dispute that had better be determined by a skilled arbitrator than by the courts, and never intended that the difference should be split up, part to go before one tribunal and part before another.—COUNSEL, *T. W. Chitty* and *Gilchrist Alexander*; *C. A. Russell*, Q.C., and *W. J. Noble*. SOLICITORS, *George Turnbull*, Bradford; *C. H. Mason*.

[Reported by W. F. BARRY, Barrister-at-Law.]

High Court—Chancery Division.

***Re* HOCKLEY HALL AND WHATELEY COLLIERIES AND BRICKWORKS (LIM.).** Byrne, J. 22nd April.

TRUSTEE—CORPORATE TRUSTEE—CORPORATION DISSOLVED—NEW TRUSTEE APPOINTED—TRUST FOR DEBENTURE-HOLDERS—TRUSTEE ACT, 1893, ss. 26, 26.

In 1892 the above-named collieries issued first mortgage debentures and executed a trust deed, by which certain freehold property was conveyed to one James Balfour, as trustee for the debenture-holders. In 1893 Balfour retired from the trusteeship, and under a power in the trust deed the debenture-holders appointed the General Securities Trust and Agency (Limited) to be a new trustee under the trust deed in the place of the retiring trustee. In 1896 the General Securities Trust and Agency (Limited) went into voluntary liquidation, the final meeting of shareholders was held on the 15th of June, 1897, and a return being made to the registrar of joint-stock companies on the 18th of June, 1897, the company was, under section 143 of the Companies Act, 1862, deemed to be dissolved on the expiration of three months from the latter date. The debenture-holders now applied by summons to have a new trustee of the trust deed appointed and to have the freehold land vested in the new trustee by the court.

BYRNE, J., made an order under sections 25 and 26 (1) of the Trustee Act, 1893, appointing a single new trustee of the trust deed, and vesting the land in him for the estate therein which was vested in the General Securities Trust and Agency (Limited) immediately before its dissolution. And the new trustee was authorized to pay the costs of the applicants out of any moneys coming to his hands under the trusts of the deed.—COUNSEL, *T. R. Hughes*; *Theobald*. SOLICITORS, *Oliver Jones, Billson, & Co.*, Liverpool; *Thorne & Welsford*.

[Reported by N. TEBBUTT, Barrister-at-Law.]

WEEKES *v.* THE KENT, SUSSEX, AND GENERAL LAND SOCIETY (LIM.). Kekewich, J. 23rd April.

COMPANY—INLAND REVENUE—INCOME TAX—PREFERENTIAL PAYMENTS—DEBENTURE-HOLDERS—COMMENCEMENT OF WINDING UP—PREFERENTIAL PAYMENTS IN BANKRUPTCY ACT, 1888 (51 & 52 VICT. c. 62), s. 1 (1) (A)—PREFERENTIAL PAYMENTS IN BANKRUPTCY AMENDMENT ACT, 1897 (60 & 61 VICT. c. 19), s. 2.

Summons. This was an application on the part of the Commissioners of Inland Revenue that the claim of the Crown, amounting to £89 3s. 6d. in respect of income tax charged on the defendant company for the year 1893 ending on the 5th of April, 1894, be allowed as a preferential claim and paid in full by the official liquidator and receiver on behalf of the debenture-holders. By the Preferential Payments in Bankruptcy Act, 1888, s. 1, sub-section 1 (*a*), priority in payment to all other debts was given (*inter alia*) to income tax assessed (on any company being wound up under the Companies Act, 1862) up to the 5th of April next before the commencement of the winding up, and not exceeding in the whole one year's assessment. Section 2 of the Preferential Payments in Bankruptcy Amendment Act, 1897, enacts that: "In the winding up of any company under the Companies Act, 1862, and the Acts amending the same, the debts mentioned in section 1 of the Preferential Payments in Bankruptcy Act, 1888, shall, so far as the assets of the company available for payment of general creditors may be insufficient to meet them, have priority over the claims of holders of debentures or debenture stock under any floating charge created by such company, and shall be paid accordingly out of any property comprised in or subject to such charge." The later Act received the Royal Assent on the 15th of July, 1897, but there is no time specified in the Act for its commencement. In the present case the winding up commenced, and this debenture-holders' action was brought before the 15th of July, 1897, and the question which the court was asked to decide was whether or not the Act was retrospective. Counsel for the company referred to the judgment of Wright, J., given two days previously in the case of *Re Waverley Typewriter*, when a precisely similar question was determined in favour of the company. The case of *Anglo-French Co-operative Society* (32 W. R. 748) was also referred to.

KEKEWICH, J.—I shall not express any opinion, but simply follow Wright, J.'s, decision and hold that the Act is not retrospective, and therefore does not apply to the present case. I do not see why I should not make the Commissioners of Inland Revenue pay the costs which they have caused the other side to incur.—COUNSEL, *Vaughan Hawkins*; *Kerly*. SOLICITORS, *Solicitors of Inland Revenue*; *Kerly, Son, & Verden*.

[Reported by R. J. A. MORRISON, Barrister-at-Law.]

EHRMANN *v.* BARTHOLOMEW. Romer, J. 1st and 26th April.

CONTRACT OF SERVICE—WINE MERCHANT'S TRAVELLER—NEGATIVE STIPULATION AGAINST DOING OTHER BUSINESS—INJUNCTION.

Motion. The plaintiffs were a firm of London wine merchants. The defendant had been a traveller in their employment engaged to act as such for ten years by articles of agreement dated the 24th of August, 1897. The present motion was brought by plaintiffs to restrain the defendant from engaging or employing himself in any other business than that of plaintiffs' firm, and in particular from acting as traveller for Messrs. Marzell & Co., another firm of London wine merchants, and from soliciting orders for them during the term of the said agreement. Clause 3 in said agreement was as follows: "The traveller shall diligently and continuously employ himself as traveller of the firm for the

purpose of selling the firm's goods, and shall use his best endeavours to obtain new customers for the firm and to extend business, and shall devote the whole of his time during the usual business hours to the transaction of the business of the firm, and shall not in any manner directly or indirectly engage or employ himself in any other business or transact any business with or for any person or persons other than the firm during the continuance of this agreement." The only provision for determining the said agreement was by notice given by the plaintiffs, and there was no provision in the agreement for defendant determining his employment thereunder. Notwithstanding this fact the defendant wrote on the 1st of March, 1898, a letter in which he purported to resign his position as traveller. The plaintiffs, in reply, wrote to him refusing to accept his resignation, and pointing out that under the terms of the agreement there was no power for the defendant to terminate his employment, and upon it appearing that he had entered the employment of a rival firm, instituted the action on which the present motion was brought.

ROMER, J., said that the question was whether the negative covenant in clause 3 was not too general for the court to enforce. His lordship pointed out that the word "business" in clause 3 could not be held limited by the context to a wine merchant's business. The court in effect was asked to order the defendant to work for plaintiffs by enforcing the terms of clause 3, and thereby compelling him to abstain wholly from other business, at any rate during all the usual business hours. He considered such a clause was unreasonable, and ought not to be enforced by the court. In *Whitwood Chemical Co.* v. *Hardman* (1891, 2 Ch. 416) the present Master of the Rolls stated that "cases where negative stipulations in contracts of service were enforced by the court ought not to be extended, and should be regarded as anomalies which it would be very dangerous to extend." In his lordship's opinion it would be such a dangerous extension to enforce so general a covenant as contained in clause 3 in the present case, as the negative stipulation extended to business of any kind, and was not confined to special services, as in *Lumley* v. *Wagner* (1 De G. M. & G. 604). He therefore refused the motion, but without costs.—COUNSEL, *H. E. Wright; S. O. Buckmaster.* SOLICITORS, *W. H. Southern; Goren & Tapp.*

[Reported by RALEGH B. PHILLPOTTS, Barrister-at-Law.]

Re **RITSON. RITSON** *v.* **RITSON.** Romer, J. April 22.

PARTNERSHIP—DEPOSIT OF TITLE DEEDS BY A PARTNER TO SECURE OVERDRAFT OF FIRM—REAL ESTATE—DEVISE OF REAL ESTATE—PARTNERSHIP ASSETS SUFFICIENT—LOCKE KING'S ACT (17 & 18 VICT. c. 113).

Summons. A testator deposited title deeds of certain rent-charges belonging to him to secure the overdraft of the bank account of a partnership in which he and his brother were partners. By his will, dated 1897, the testator devised and bequeathed all his real and personal estate to trustees upon trust for his wife for life and on her death upon trust as to certain real estate, which included the real estate charged to the bank, for his son absolutely, and as to all the residue of his real and personal estate upon trust for his (the testator's) children equally. At the testator's death both his private account and the partnership account were largely overdrawn at the bank, but the assets of the partnership were more than sufficient to cover all their debts. The chief question raised by the summons was whether that part of the amount due from the partnership to the bankers, secured by the said memorandum, as was payable by the estate of the testator ought to be paid out of the real estate mentioned in the memorandum, or out of his share in the partnership assets.

ROMER, J., said that in his opinion the memorandum of deposit only extended to partnership debts and not to the private overdraft of the testator, and that as the partnership assets were sufficient for payment of all debts of the partnership, the debt to the bank was payable thereout, and was not a charge on the real estate comprised in the memorandum.—COUNSEL, *R. F. Norton; Christopher James.* SOLICITORS, *Speechly, Mumford, & Rodgers*, for *Hayton & Simpson*, Cockermouth.

Reported by RALEGH B. PHILLPOTTS, Barrister at-Law.)

High Court—Queen's Bench Division.

LEICESTER COUNTY COUNCIL *v.* **LEICESTER ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE.** Div. Court. 22nd April.

POOR RATE—EXEMPTION—CROWN PURPOSES—PART OF POLICE PREMISES USED BY SUPERINTENDENT FOR RESIDENCE.

This was a special case stated under 12 & 13 Vict. c. 45, s. 11, after notice of appeal against a poor rate made on the chief constable's residence at Leicester. In 1867 the police premises, including the chief constable's residence, had been assessed to the Poor Rate of St. Martin's Parish, Leicester. The justices appealed, and the Court of Queen's Bench decided that the justices were not liable to poor rate for such premises: *Reg.* v. *St. Martin's, Leicester* (2 Q. B. 493). In 1897 the rate in question was made, but was only in respect of the portions of the police buildings used exclusively for residential purposes, which consist in part of certain rooms occupied rent-free by the chief constable of the county in his official capacity. The question was whether this portion was occupied as Crown offices exclusively. The rest of the building is occupied for ordinary police purposes. On the 1st of April, 1889, by virtue of section 64 of the Local Government Act, 1889 (51 & 52 Vict. c. 41), the property passed from the justices and vested in the county council. If the report of the annual Government inspection is satisfactory, one-half of the cost of the pay and clothing for the preceding year is chargeable on the "Exchequer Contribution Account" in substitution of the grant previously made by the Exchequer. Counsel for the appellants contended that no part of the buildings, the subject of the special case, should be rated since they formed part of the police offices, and were occupied for police purposes; and the following cases were cited: *Reg.* v. *Stewart* (8 E. & B. 360, 27 L. J. M. C. 81), *Gambier* v. *Lydford* (3 E. & B. 346, 23 L. J. M. C. 69), *Martin* v. *West Derby Assessment Committee* (11 Q. B. D. 145), and *Reg.* v. *Lancashire Justices* (27 L. J. M. C. 209). Counsel in support of the rate submitted that the old authorities referred to by the appellants did not apply since the ownership had been transferred from the justices to the county council. Where a building was used partly for Crown purposes and partly for administrative county purposes, it might be split up for rating purposes according to the purposes for which each portion of it was used: *County Council of Middlesex* v. *Assessment Committee of St. George's Union* (1897, 1 Q. B. 64), *Worcestershire County Council* v. *Assessment Committee of St. Nicholas, Worcester* (1897, 1 Q. B. 480), *Greig* v. *University of Edinburgh* (L. R. 1 H. L. 348). That portion occupied by the superintendent and his family was rateable.

THE COURT (WILLS and KENNEDY, JJ.) allowed the appeal. The question here was whether occupation of rooms by the chief constable and his family was an occupation of that particular part of the premises "for police purposes." They thought it was. It was clear therefore that the rate had been improperly made in respect of that portion of the premises in question.—COUNSEL, *E. W. Garrett* and *S Everard; Hugo Young* and *C. B. Marriott.* SOLICITORS, *Kingsford, Dorman, & Co.*, for *Freer, Blunt, & Co*, Leicester; *Field, Roscoe, & Co.*, for *Wheatstone & Frost*, Leicester.

[Reported by ERSKINE REID, Barrister-at-Law.]

HORNER *v.* **LEWIS.** Div. Court. 21st April.

MEDICAL PRACTITIONER—RIGHT OF ACTION—FEE FOR POST-MORTEM EXAMINATION AND ATTENDANCE AT INQUEST—PUBLIC HOSPITAL—MEDICAL OFFICER—CORONERS ACT, 1887 (50 & 51 VICT. c. 71), s. 22, PROVISO (2).

This was an appeal from the Brentwood County Court. The appellant was one of the honorary medical officers of the Children's and General Hospital for Leyton, Walthamstow, and Wanstead. On the 25th of August, 1897, the respondent, the coroner for South Essex, held an inquest on the body of a child named Harriett Palmer. The child had been a patient in the hospital, and the appellant had attended it during its illness. By order of the respondent he made a *post-mortem* examination of the body and attended the inquest and gave evidence respecting the death. The appellant sued the respondent for two guineas for making the *post-mortem* examination and for attending at the inquest. The county court judge dismissed the action on the ground that the appellant was precluded from recovering the fees by section 22, proviso (2), of the Coroners Act, 1887 (50 & 51 Vict. c. 71). Section 22 provides for the payment of fees to legally qualified medical practitioners for making *post-mortem* examinations and for attending to give evidence at inquests, with a proviso (2) that "Where an inquest is held on the body of a person who has died in a county or other lunatic asylum, or in a public hospital, infirmary, or other medical institution, or a building or place belonging thereto, or used for the reception of patients thereof, whether the same be supported by endowments or by voluntary subscriptions, the medical officer, whose duty it may have been to attend the deceased person as a medical officer of such institution as aforesaid, shall not be entitled to such fee or remuneration." The Children's and General Hospital was founded for the benefit of poor persons residing in Leyton, Walthamstow, and Wanstead. Patients from those districts were admitted by a governor's letter free of charge, while patients from neighbouring parishes might be admitted by governors' letters on a payment of not less than 5s. a week. Intending patients had to be certified by a doctor to be neither infectious nor incurable. The hospital was supported by public subscriptions and governed by a council and a committee. One medical officer was appointed from each parish who had charge of all the patients admitted from that parish. It was contended on behalf of the appellant that the hospital was not a public institution, and that the appellant was not a medical officer of the hospital as he received no fee or reward for his services.

THE COURT (WILLS and KENNEDY, JJ.) held that the hospital was a public one and that appellant was none the less a medical officer because he received no payment for his services. They said that the word "duty" in section 22 was to be taken not to be confined to a strict legal duty, but was applicable to the duty of imperfect obligation attached to the appellant's acceptance of the position he held in the hospital.—COUNSEL, *Marshall*, Q.C., and *Samuel Fleming; Macmorran*, Q.C., and *Braxton Hicks.* SOLICITORS, *Hempsons; Langhams.*

[Reported by C. G. WILBRAHAM, Barrister-at-Law.]

BLENKINSOP *v.* **OGDEN & CO.** Div. Court. 23rd April.

FACTORY ACTS—FENCING MACHINERY—PERSON INJURED BY HIS OWN NEGLIGENCE—FACTORY AND WORKSHOPS ACT, 1878 (41 VICT. c. 16), s. 82.

This was a special case stated by a metropolitan police magistrate. The respondents were the occupiers of a factory within the Factories and Workshops Acts, 1878 to 1895. An information and complaint was laid against them by the appellant, under section 82 of the Act of 1878, for having neglected to fence certain dangerous parts of their machinery, in consequence of which a boy in their employment suffered bodily injury. Section 81 of the Act of 1878 provides that if a factory or workshop is not kept in conformity with the Act the occupier shall be liable to a fine not exceeding £10, and section 82 provides as follows: "If any person is killed or suffers any bodily injury in consequence of the occupier of a

factory having neglected to fence any machinery required by or in pursuance of this Act to be securely fenced, . . . the occupier of the factory or workshop shall be liable to a fine not exceeding £100, the whole or any part of which may be applied for the benefit of the injured person or his family, or otherwise as the Secretary of State determines. . . ." The machinery at the point where the accident happened was not properly fenced, but the accident was due to the boy's own negligence. The magistrate thereupon dismissed the information. It was argued on behalf of the respondents that the information was rightly dismissed, because in order to substantiate the offence under section 82 it was necessary to shew that the injury to the person employed was proximately caused by the neglect of the respondents to fence the machinery, and that, in the present case, the injury having been the result of the boy's own negligence, it could not be said to have been "in consequence of" the respondents' neglect.

THE COURT (GRANTHAM and KENNEDY, JJ.) remitted the case to the magistrate.

GRANTHAM, J., said that the magistrate was wrong, because, though the injury was attributable to the boy's own negligence, yet that did not prevent it from being said to occur in consequence of the respondents' neglect to fence. The object of the section was to inflict a more serious fine in cases where injury had actually arisen.

KENNEDY, J., said that it would be wrong to read the words "in consequence of" in the section as if one were considering the rights of the parties in an action where one person sued another for damages for injuries alleged to have been caused by the negligence of the latter. The object of the Act was to ensure that the machinery in factories and workshops was safe. It was quite reasonable for the Legislature to say that where a person had been injured in a factory, the factory owner should be punished more severely, although the circumstances of the injury were such that the person injured could not have recovered damages in an action at law. It was suggested that this reading of the section would include the case where a person intentionally killed or injured himself in unfenced machinery, but such a person would not be one who "is killed or suffers bodily injury" within the meaning of the section.—COUNSEL, *Sutton; Rueyg*, Q.C., and *Foreman*. SOLICITORS, *Treasury Solicitor; B. Webb*.

[Reported by C. G. WILBRAHAM, Barrister-at-Law.]

CASES OF LAST SITTINGS.

High Court—Queen's Bench Division.

CESSFORD *v.* DOVER HARBOUR BOARD. Wills, J. 1st April.

LANDLORD AND TENANT—NUISANCE—COVENANT FOR QUIET ENJOYMENT—DEROGATION FROM GRANT—WORKS DONE UNDER STATUTORY POWERS.

This was an action brought by the plaintiff against the defendants, who were his landlords, to recover damages in respect of his hotel being injuriously affected by works executed by the defendants on land adjoining the hotel. The plaintiff was proprietor and tenant of the Esplanade Hotel, Dover. He held a portion of the hotel (No. 18) under a lease from the defendants dated 1877 and the remaining portion (No. 17) under a lease dated 1894. In 1892, under powers granted by an Act of Parliament of 1891, the defendants began, and up to the date when this action was brought continued, to construct a new deep water harbour at Dover, and for that purpose they manufactured large concrete blocks upon the land immediately adjoining the plaintiff's hotel. The plaintiff's claim was in respect of the nuisance and loss of amenities caused by the work. He complained of the following matters: (1) The noise, dust, and smoke created by the apparatus for mixing the concrete, by the apparatus called the Goliath by which blocks of concrete were moved from place to place, and by the locomotives and steam engines and wagons employed; (2) the noise created by the landing, by means of a steam crane, of materials for making concrete; (3) the destruction of an attractive view; (4) dust and noise made in the unloading, storing, and carting of cement at a large shed erected by the defendants at the back of the hotel; (5) destruction of amenities by the erection of the same shed. The plaintiff's claim was for damages in respect of the premises as constituting (1) a nuisance; (2) a breach of the covenant for quiet enjoyment; (3) a derogation from the defendants' grant. It was contended on his behalf that the statute did not override the defendants' contractual liability towards the plaintiff as his landlords (*Sanderson* v. *Mayor of Berwick-upon-Tweed* (13 Q. B. D. 547) and *Robinson* v. *Kilvert* (4 Ch. D. 88)); and it was pointed out that the statutory powers were permissive only and not imperative. It was further contended that the defendants were liable upon the ground that, in carrying out their statutory powers, they did not employ the means least likely to cause injury to others. Upon this point *Gas Light and Coke Co.* v. *Vestry of St. Mary Abbotts* (15 Q. B. D. 1) and *Metropolitan Asylums District* v. *Hill* (6 App. Cas. 193) were cited. The defendants relied upon their Act of Parliament which authorized the works in question. It was contended that, with regard to the portion of the hotel, No. 17, held under a lease dated 1894 the plaintiff had no right of action since he took the premises with full knowledge of the inconveniences to which he would be subjected; and with regard to the remaining portion it was contended that if the plaintiff had any remedy it would be by compensation under the Lands Clauses Consolidation Act, and not by action—*Kirby* v. *School Board for Harrogate*—no action being maintainable unless the work done was in excess of the statutory powers or there was negligence in the execution of it: *Brand* v. *Hammersmith Railway Co.* (L. R. 4 H. L. 171) and *London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway Co.* v. *Truman and Others* (11 App. Cas. 45). The jury on the assumption that a right of action existed gave a verdict for £800.

WILLS, J., gave judgment for the plaintiff in respect of item (4) of the plaintiff's claim and assessed the proportion of damage due to that cause at £200. He said, as to the other items of claim, that the works from which they arose were a fair and reasonable exercise of the defendants' statutory powers and that, consequently, in respect of those matters the plaintiff's remedy was by compensation under the Lands Clauses Act, 1845, and not by action; but as to the matters complained of in item (4) the action was maintainable because the nuisance might be greatly mitigated by the unloading, storing, &c., being carried on inside the shed built by the defendants instead of outside. It lay on the defendants to shew that what was done was a necessary, or at least reasonable, exercise of their powers. The judgment proceeded as follows: "I must now deal with one of Mr. Dickens' points. He argued that in respect of the nuisances generally and in respect of the destruction of the amenities, the action cannot be maintained, notwithstanding the local Acts of Parliament, on the ground that the demise implies a covenant for quiet enjoyment, which has been broken, and that the acts of the defendants derogate from their grant. I do not think so, however. I cannot see why Acts of Parliament should not legalize acts which would otherwise be actionable wrongs, because the particular form of actionable wrong consists in a breach of contract either express or implied. Were it otherwise, the result of an action such as this might be an injunction which would stop the important public works authorized by the Legislature. Neither does it seem to me to make any difference, as to the question between action and compensation, whether the plaintiff's right accrued under leases granted before or after the Acts of Parliament or either of them. The consideration upon which the decision of this question turns is, 'Were the Acts complained of within the statutory power?' If so, no matter when or how the plaintiff's rights arose, it is a case for compensation, not action. As to a portion of the plaintiff's hotel, No. 17, it is clear to me that no claim on the ground of covenant for quiet enjoyment arising since 1894 can be maintained in any shape. The plaintiff took a new lease of No. 17 in 1894, and the correspondence shews that he took it with full knowledge of the circumstances, and it is clear that, under the circumstances of this case, either the nuisances are not a breach of the covenant or the lease does not express the intention of the parties in this respect and ought to be reformed. This question, however, is rather academical than practical, as there is nothing in the facts to which I have referred that, so far as I can see, interferes with the right of the plaintiff to obtain whatever compensation he may be entitled to under the Lands Clauses Act."—COUNSEL, *Dickens*, Q.C., and *F. M. Abrahams; Lawson Walton*, Q.C., and *J. Elton Bankes*. SOLICITORS, *Michael Abrahams, Son, & Co.; Bower, Cotton, & Bower*.

[Reported by C. G. WILBRAHAM, Barrister-at-Law.]

SAUNDERS (Appellant) *v.* THORNEY (Respondent). Div. Court. 5th April.

LICENSING LAW—SUNDAY CLOSING—DELIVERY ON SUNDAY OF BEER ORDERED ON SATURDAY—OPENING HOUSE FOR SALE DURING CLOSING HOURS—SUNDAY CLOSING (WALES) ACT, 1881 (44 & 45 VICT. c. 61), ss. 1, 2—LICENSING ACT, 1874 (37 & 38 VICT. c. 49), s. 9.

Case stated by justices of the peace sitting as a court of summary jurisdiction at Aberdare, in the county of Glamorgan. An information was laid under section 1 of the Sunday Closing (Wales) Act, 1881 (44 & 45 Vict. c. 61), by the respondent, who was a superintendent of police, against the appellant for having on Sunday, the 14th day of November, 1897, at the parish of Aberdare—he then being a person licensed for the sale of beer by retail at his house and premises—unlawfully opened his house for the sale of beer on the said Sunday. After hearing the evidence, the justices convicted the appellant and fined him twenty shillings and costs At the hearing the following facts were proved: The appellant is a beer-house-keeper and holds a beerhouse licence under the Act 1 Will. 4, c. 64, and the Acts amending the same, in respect of certain premises occupied by him and authorizing him to sell by retail beer to be consumed on or off the premises. On Sunday, the 14th of November, 1897, about 10 o'clock at night, a girl was seen by a police-constable to come out of the appellant's house by the front door, and upon going up to her the constable found that she had two bottles of porter. He took her back to the appellant's house and saw the appellant and asked why he had supplied the porter. He said he had not done so. His wife, who was present, said she had supplied the girl with the two bottles for a Mr. Watkins, and there were ten more to come, as he had ordered and paid for a dozen there yesterday. It was explained on behalf of the appellant, which explanation was accepted as a fact by the justices, that the said Mr. Watkins had ordered of the appellant's wife and paid two shillings for a case of a dozen bottles of porter on the Saturday evening which she, the appellant's wife, arranged to deliver at Watkins' house on the Saturday, but having met with an accident by falling down and spraining her arm, she had forgotten to give instructions for the delivery of the porter. Watkins on the Sunday night, finding that the porter had not been delivered as arranged, sent over his servant, who was the girl stopped by the constable, to the appellant's house and requested the appellant's wife to let him have two of the bottles of porter. It was contended on behalf of the appellant that under the circumstances aforesaid the appellant had not opened his house for the sale of beer on the said Sunday within the meaning of section 9 of the Licensing Act, 1874 (37 & 38 Vict. c. 49), which by section 2 of the Sunday Closing (Wales) Act, 1881 (44 & 45 Vict. c. 61), applies to

premises closed under the last-named Act. The justices were of opinion that the sale of the porter was not complete until delivery, and that in delivering the two bottles on the Sunday the appellant opened his house for the sale of intoxicating liquors within the meaning of section 9 of the Licensing Act, 1874. The question of law for the opinion of the court was whether under the circumstances the justices were right in holding that intoxicating liquor having been ordered of the appellant and paid for during the time his licensed premises were allowed to be open, but delivered by him during the period during which his premises were required to be closed, constituted the offence of opening his house for the sale of beer during prohibited hours. The Sunday Closing (Wales) Act, 1881 (44 & 45 Vict. c. 61), provides, section 1: "In the Principality of Wales all premises in which intoxicating liquors are sold or exposed for sale by retail shall be closed during the whole of Sunday"; section 2: "The Licensing Acts, 1872-1874, shall apply in the case of any premises closed under this Act as if they had been closed under those Acts." The Licensing Act, 1874 (37 & 38 Vict. c. 49), provides, section 9: "Any person who, during the time at which premises for the sale of intoxicating liquors are directed to be closed by or in pursuance of this Act, sells or exposes for sale in such premises any intoxicating liquors, or opens or keeps open such premises for the sale of intoxicating liquors, . . . shall for the first offence be liable to a penalty not exceeding ten pounds, and for any subsequent offence to a penalty not exceeding twenty pounds."

THE COURT (Lord RUSSELL OF KILLOWEN, C.J., and CHANNELL, J.) upheld the decision of the magistrates, and dismissed the appeal.

Lord RUSSELL OF KILLOWEN, C.J.—In my judgment the magistrates were right in this case. I base my judgment first upon the exact facts of this case, and the decision in the view of the court is not a decision upon any facts except the exact facts of this case. The charge against the appellant was based on section 9 of the Licensing Act, 1874, and the offence was committed in the Principality of Wales, in which there was in operation the Sunday Closing Act, 1881. The charge against the appellant was that on the day in question he had kept his premises open for the sale of intoxicating liquors. The facts were these. The magistrates believed the version of the matter given by the appellant's wife, that a person had ordered from her on the Saturday a dozen bottles of porter, but that owing to an accident this was not delivered on the Saturday at the time it ought to have been delivered. What was the legal effect of the transaction on the Sunday? The whole transaction was simply a contract on the part of the licensed victualler to sell a case of twelve bottles of porter; a contract which would have been satisfied by the sale of any twelve bottles of porter. There was no appropriation of any specific goods, and the matter rested therefore entirely on contract and no property passed under or by virtue of that contract. Then on the Sunday the house was opened for the delivery of these two bottles of porter, in respect of which no property had passed to the purchaser. Is that or is it not evidence of an offence within section 9? In my judgment—not without some doubt—I think it was. I think the delivery on the Sunday was a material part in the carrying out and giving effect to the contract which was made on the Saturday, a contract under which no specific goods were appropriated. That seems to me to be the legal effect of what took place, and I arrive at the conclusion that there was sufficient to justify the magistrates in coming to the conclusion they did come to, that the appellant had committed an offence within the section. It is perfectly clear that if publicans were to be allowed to say that although they delivered beer on the Sunday it was in pursuance of antecedent contracts made on the Saturday without any specific appropriation of the goods, it would open a very wide door to an evasion of what must have been the intention of the Legislature.

CHANNELL, J.—I am of the same opinion. I think a person opens his premises for the sale of intoxicating liquors within the meaning of section 9 when he opens them for the carrying out of any material part of the transaction of sale.—COUNSEL, *S. T. Evans; W. D. Benson.* SOLICITORS, *Bell, Brodrick, & Gray*, for *Linton & C. & W. Kenshole*, Aberdare; *Wrentmore & Son*, for *Lewis & Jones*, Merthyr Tydfil.

[Reported by Sir SHERSTON BAKER, Bart., Barrister-at-Law.]

LEGAL NEWS.

APPOINTMENTS.

Mr. WALTER HENRY MACNAMARA, barrister, has been appointed an Assistant Master of the Queen's Bench Division. Mr. Macnamara also holds the office of Registrar to the Railway and Canal Commission.

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON, Q.C., M.P., of the Northern Circuit, and Mr. H. Y. STANGER, Q.C., of the Midland Circuit, have been elected Benchers of the Honourable Society of Lincoln's-inn, in succession to the late Sir Frank Lockwood, Q.C., and the late Mr. F. W. Gibbs, Q.C., C.B.

Mr. LOUIS A. KERSHAW, Q.C., has received the honour of Knighthood on his appointment to the office of Chief Justice of the High Court at Allahabad.

CHANGES IN PARTNERSHIPS.

DISSOLUTIONS.

JABEZ MCDIARMID, WILLIAM LINSEY TEATHER, and FREDERICK WILLIAM HILL, solicitors (McDiarmid, Teather, & Hill), 5, Newman's-court, Cornhill. March 31. So far as regards the said William Linsey Teather, who retires from the firm.

CHAS. W. WRIGHT, C. PERCY CHARLESWORTH, RICHARD WILSON, and GEO. K. CHARLESWORTH, solicitors (Wright, Charlesworths, & Wilson, and Charlesworth & Co.), Skipton and Settle. So far as Charles William Wright is concerned. [*Gazette*, April 22.

GENERAL.

Lord Justice Williams has been absent from the Appeal Court for some days in consequence of the serious illness of his son, Mr. Roland Vaughan Williams.

The list of the House of Lords consists of twenty-one cases, of which eighteen are English and three are Scotch appeals, there being none from Ireland. There are also nine cases awaiting judgment.

It is stated that 100 Chancery witness actions are now in course of transfer to Mr. Justice Byrne for hearing, of which 40 are from the list of Mr. Justice North, and 30 each from Mr. Justice Stirling and Mr. Justice Romer.

Mr. Justice Wright will preside at the last of the series of law lectures given under the auspices the Solicitors' Managing Clerks' Association, which will take place in the Lecture Room, Gray's-inn, on Tuesday evening next, when Mr. H. Reed, Q.C., will deliver an address on the subject of "Bills of Sale."

The *Times* says that to show the increasing number of actions entered in the Commercial List, it may be mentioned that Mr. Justice Mathew had fifty-four summonses relating to these cases before him for hearing on Saturday last, eighteen of which were marked to be attended by counsel. The learned judge disposed of all of them except three or four, which were adjourned.

Mr. Justice Hawkins, says the *Times*, is not expected to return to the Law Courts until the beginning of next week, as he is prolonging his Eater holiday in consequence of having to forego the ensuing Whitsun vacation. As the learned judge will have to start on the South-Eastern Circuit for the Summer Assizes at the end of May next, he will consequently be sitting during the Whitsun holidays.

Sir Henry Fowler was, says the *Pall Mall Gazette*, suddenly seized with illness in the House of Commons on the 21st inst. In the midst of a speech on the Budget he abruptly stopped, sat down on the Front Opposition Bench, and drew his hand across his forehead. The faintness happily passed off in a few moments, and Sir Henry was able to conclude his remarks.

On Saturday last, says the *Daily Telegraph*, on the screen board in the halls of the four Inns of Court there appeared the names of forty-two gentlemen desirous of being called to the Bar in the present Easter Term. This is a smaller number than usual, and it is a singular fact that barristers to the number of four only, and one solicitor, send up their sons to follow the profession of the law in its higher branch. An African king and an Austrian baron supply a son apiece. Lincoln's-inn is exceptional in "calling" seven natives of India. The Inner Temple heads the list with 17, Lincoln's-inn counts 14, the Middle Temple 7, and Gray's-inn a modest 4.

A solicitor writes to the *Times* pointing out that "the Chancery Division begins the Easter sittings with a list of no less than 685 cases. Many of these have already been set down to be heard for the last six months, and many of them will not be heard for another twelve. This is a perfect scandal and reproach to the administration of justice. Forty years ago, when there were only two equity judges to do the work—the Vice-Chancellor of England and the Master of the Rolls—105 cases pending before the former and 80 before the latter were thought sufficient warrant for appointing two more Vice-Chancellors. Now there are 137 before each judge on the average, and yet the only relief is to call in a Divorce judge now and then. This is a most ridiculous remedy for the evil. To keep down arrears properly there ought to be at least four more equity judges. All this delay only heaps up expense, worry, anxiety, and vexation, and locks up millions of unemployed capital."

The Standing Committee of the House of Commons on Law sat on Tuesday to consider the Solicitors (Ireland) Bill. On Clause 6, which declares that no person shall act as solicitor unless admitted and enrolled, the Solicitor-General for Ireland moved an amendment providing that a clerk or officer appointed for that purpose might act for the solicitor for any Government department in any petty sessions court. The amendment was agreed to, and the clause as amended was added to the Bill. Mr. Greene moved an amendment to clause 16 permitting *bonâ fide* clerks to solicitors for seven years to be admitted after three years' service. He proposed that the seven should be altered to ten, in order to bring the provision into conformity with English practice. The amendment was rejected. A good deal of discussion took place on the clauses dealing with the procedure relating to striking off the roll. Serjeant Hemphill proposed an amendment empowering the disciplinary committee of the Incorporated Law Society to "require the attendance of witnesses" for the purpose of inquiry or application made to them under the Act. Without this power, he said, the inquiry would in many instances be abortive. Mr. T. M. Healy thought it highly undesirable to give this power in a country where there was great jealousy of the erection of new courts. Why was the bar not to have this power? The amendment was negatived. Mr. T. M. Healy congratulated his countrymen on having thus escaped the setting-up in their midst by wily English solicitors of a little inquisitorial court which would afterwards be transferred to this country. The Bill as amended was ordered to be reported to the House

COURT PAPERS.

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE.

ROTA OF REGISTRARS IN ATTENDANCE ON

Date.	APPEAL COURT No. 2.	Mr. Justice NORTH.	Mr. Justice STIRLING.
Monday, May 2	Mr. Beal	Mr. Jackson	Mr. Pugh
Tuesday 3	Leach	Carrington	Lavie
Wednesday 4	Beal	Jackson	Pugh
Thursday 5	Leach	Carrington	Lavie
Friday 6	Beal	Jackson	Pugh
Saturday 7	Leach	Carrington	Lavie
	Mr. Justice KEKEWICH.	Mr. Justice ROMER.	Mr. Justice BYRNE.
Monday, May 2	Mr. King	Mr. Godfrey	Mr. Pemberton
Tuesday 3	Farmer	Rolt	Ward
Wednesday 4	King	Godfrey	Pemberton
Thursday 5	Farmer	Rolt	Ward
Friday 6	King	Godfrey	Pemberton
Saturday 7	Farmer	Rolt	Ward

COURT OF APPEAL.

EASTER SITTINGS, 1898.

(*Continued from p.* 437.)

Hallett v Hallett app of dft G Hallett from order of Mr Justice Gorell Barnes (sitting, &c.), dated Feb 9, 1898

Wright v Long app of plt from order of Mr Justice Gorell Barnes (sitting, &c.), dated Feb 4, 1898 (order not perfected) March 7

In re R P Jones In re G A E P Jones Billington v Bygott app of plt from order of Mr Justice Byrne, dated Dec 11, 1897 March 8

In re The Registered Trade Mark, No. 70,078, by Wright, Crossley, & Co. and the Patents, Designs, &c. Acts app of The Royal Baking Powder Co. from order of Mr Justice Romer, dated March 4, 1898 (order not perfected) March 9

Clark v E Sharp & Co app of plt from order of Mr. Justice Byrne, dated Feb 15, 1898 March 11

Ecroyd v Coulthard app of John Leach & anr from order of Mr Justice North, dated March 23, 1898 March 16

In re Perkins Poyser v Beyfus app of dfts from order of Mr Justice North, dated Feb 23, 1898 (order not perfected) March 18

In re Woods & Lewis & V & P Act, 1874 app of Barnet-Lewis from order of Mr Justice Romer, dated March 4, 1898 March 18

In re The Truffault Cycle & Tube Manufacturing Co ld and In re Companies Acts, 1862 to 1890 app of company from order of Mr Justice Byrne, dated March 16, 1898 (order not perfected) March 23

In re The Companies Acts, 1862 to 1890 & In re Baxters ld app of Baxters ld from order of Mr Justice Wright, dated March 2, 1898 March 24

Brabourne v Anglo-Austrian Print & Publishing Co ld Dobell v Same app of Nunn & Popham from order of Mr Justice Wright, dated March 16, 1898 (order not perfected) March 26

Ward v Mayor, &c of Boro' of Portsmouth app of plt from order of Mr Justice Byrne, dated March 25, 1898 (order not perfected) March 28

In re The Companies Acts, 1862 to 1890, and In re The General Phosphate Corpn ld app of The Mortgage Insce Corpn ld from order of Mr Justice Wright, dated March 23, 1898 (order not perfected) March 28

Osmond's ld v Balmoral Cycle Co app of dfts from order of Mr Justice Kennedy (for Mr Justice North), dated March 29, 1898 (order not perfected) April 2

In re The Inverell Diamond Field ld & Co's Acts, 1862 to 1890 app of the Honduras Government Banking & Trading Co ld from order of Mr Justice North, dated April 1, 1898 (order not perfected) April 5

Attorney-Gen v Siddall app of deft from order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated January 21, 1898 April 5

Manchester, Sheffield, & Lincolnshire Ry Co v Anderson app of deft from order of Mr. Justice Byrne, dated March 24, 1898 (order not perfected) April 6

Day v Challis app of plts from order of Mr Justice Byrne, dated April 1, 1898 (order not perfected) April 6

In re The City Assets Co ld & Clarkson & V & P Act, 1874 app of the City Assets Co from order of Mr Justice Stirling, dated March 14, 1898 (order not perfected) April 6

Bence v Shearman app of deft TShearman (from order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated Feb 11, 1898 April 7

In re White Pennell v Franklin app of deft from order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated Jan 13, 1898 April 7

FROM THE QUEEN'S BENCH DIVISION.

For Herring.

(Final List.)

1897.

Oxley (an infant) v Wilks & ors app of dfts from judgt of Mr Justice Darling, dated Nov 15, 1897, at trial with common jury, Middlesex Nov 29

Lyons v Showell's Brewery Co ld app of plt from judgt of Mr Justice Mathew, dated Nov 22, 1897, at trial without a jury, Middlesex Dec 1

Harding v Pooley app of dft from judgt of Justices Wright and Kennedy, dated Nov 3, 1897 Dec 1

Clarkson v Button app of dft from judgt of Mr Justice Ridley, dated Nov 26, 1897, at trial without a jury, Middlesex Dec 1

Wiesener v Levison app of dft from judgt of Mr Justice Darling, dated Nov 10, 1897, at trial without a jury, Middlesex Dec 3

Attorney-Gen (Informant) v C M Strange (Revenue) app of informant from judgt of Justices Vaughan Williams and Kennedy, dated Aug 12, 1897 Dec 6

Hall v Mildren app of dft from judgt of Mr Justice Channell, dated Nov 12, 1897, at trial without a jury, Middlesex Dec 6

Stange & Co v Lowitz app of dft from judgt of Mr Justice Ridley, dated Nov 24, 1897, at trial without a jury, Middlesex (security ordered) Dec 8

E J Phillips v The School Board for London (Crown Side) app of plt from judgt of Justices Wright and Kennedy, dated Oct 27, 1897 Dec 9

R K Cockerton v The School Board for London (Crown Side) app of plt from judgt of Justices Wright and Kennedy, dated Oct 27, 1897 Dec 9

Sea Insurance Co, ld & anor v Blogg app of dft from judgt of Mr Justice Mathew, dated Nov 5, 1897, at trial without a jury, Middlesex Dec 10

Mackinnon v Clark app of dft from judgt of Mr Justice Kennedy, dated Dec 2, 1897, at trial without a jury, Middlesex Dec 11

Belmarco v The London Hanseatic Bank, ld app of dfts from judgt of Mr Justice Mathew, dated Nov 29, 1897, at trial without a jury Dec 14

Groves v Wimborne app of plt from judgt of Mr Justice Grantham, dated Dec 3, 1897, at trial without a jury, Cardiff Dec 14

Schneker, Walford, & Co v Glanville & ors app of plts from judgt of Mr Justice Bigham, dated Dec 3, 1897, at trial without a jury, Middlesex Dec 17

Major v Storey app of plt from judgt of Mr Justice Darling, dated Dec 10, 1897, at trial without a jury, Middlesex Dec 18

The Pontefract Park Trustees (Applts) v The Assessment Committee of the Pontefract Union (Rspts) (Crown Side) app of applts from judgt of Justices Wright & Kennedy, dated Nov 26, 1897 Dec 20

J. Hartley & ors (Applts) v The Assessment Committee of the Pontefract Union (Respts) (Crown Side) app of applts from judgt of Justices Wright & Kennedy, dated Nov 26, 1897 Dec 20

Warren v Moore app of dft from judgt of Mr Justice Hawkins, dated Dec 14, 1897, at trial without a jury, Middlesex Dec 23

The West London Syndicate ld (applts) v The Commrs of Inland Revenue (rspts) (Revenue) app of applts from jdgt of Justices Grantham and Channell, dated Dec 15, 1897 Dec 30

The National Telephone Co ld (applts) v The Commrs of Inland Revenue (rspts) (Revenue) app of applts from jdgt of Justices Grantham and Channell, dated Dec 14, 1897 Dec 30

1898.

Woolf v Hamilton app of pltf from jdgt of Mr Justice Darling, dated Dec 21, 1897, at trial without a jury, Middlesex Jan 4

Andrews v Lubbock app of dft from judgt of Mr Justice Channell, dated Dec 18, 1897, at trial without a jury, Middlesex Jan 4

Parr's Banking Co, ld v Yates app of dft from judgt of Mr Justice Bruce, dated Dec 15, 1897, at trial without a jury, Liverpool Jan 6

R H Buckley & Sons, ld v N Buckley & Sons app of dfts from judgt of Mr. Justice Bruce, dated Dec 20, 1897, at trial, &c, Salford Jan 11

The Salt Union, ld v The North Staffordshire Ry Co (Railway and Canal Commission) app of applts from judgt of Mr Justice Wright, The Right Hon Sir F Peel, and The Right Hon Viscount Cobham, dated Dec 17, 1897 Jan 12

Walton v Churchill app of plt from judgt of Mr. Justice Bigham, dated Dec 13, 1897, at trial without a jury, Middlesex Jan 12

Trent Cycle Co, ld v Davis app of dft from judgt of Mr Justice Phillimore, dated Dec 20, 1897, at trial without a jury, Middlesex Jan 12

Boyd, ld v Wilkinson app of dft from judgt of Mr Justice Channell, dated Nov 5, 1897, at trial without a jury, Middlesex Jan 19

Mayor, &c of the Boro' of Thetford v County Council of Norfolk app of plt from judgt of Mr. Justice Wills, dated Dec 12, 1897, at trial without a jury and cross notice of respts, dated March 18, 1898 Jan 21

W Bartlett v H Mears & M A Box (trading, &c, as M A Box & Co) (Crown Side) app of plt from judgt of Justices Day & Lawrance, dated Jan 19, 1898 Jan 27

W Bartlett v W A Pearson & M A Box (trading, &c, as M A Box & Co) (Crown side) app of plt from judgt of Justices Day & Lawrance, dated Jan 19, 1898 Jan 27

Stirling Cycle Works v Bowden & ors app of plt from judgt of Mr Justice Kennedy, dated Jan 18, 1898, at a trial without a jury, Middlesex Jan 28

Pettick Bros (respts) v The County Council of Dorset (applts) (Crown side) app of applts from judgt of Justices Day & Lawrance, dated Jan 14, 1898 Jan 28

New London Credit Syndicate ld v Neale & ors app of plts from judgt of of Mr Justice Darling, dated Jan 15, 1898, at a trial without a jury, Middlesex Feb 3

The Queen v London County Council (Crown side) app of Commrs from judgt of Justices Day & Lawrance, dated Jan 11, 1898 Feb 3

Walker v Tafft app of dft from judgt of the Lord Chief Justice, dated Dec 18, 1897, at trial without a jury, Middlesex Feb 4

The Attorney-General v The Right Hon Earl Grey (Revenue) app of dft from judgt of Justices Grantham & Channell, dated Dec 13, 1897 Feb 5

Syer v Alder app of dft from judgt of Mr Justice Channell, dated Jan 21, 1898, at a trial without a jury, Middlesex Feb 5

Cole v Essex & anr app of plt from judgt of Mr Justice Mathew, dated Jan 24, 1898, at trial without a jury, Middlesex Feb 8
Simcoe v Pethick (Crown Side) app of dft from judgt of Justices Day & Lawrance, dated Jan 14, 1898 Feb 9
Dymock v Showell's Brewery Co ld & anr app of dfts from judgt of Mr Justice Kennedy, dated Jan 12, 1898, at trial without a jury, Liverpool Feb 9
The London & Universal Bank ld (in liquidation) v Sabow & Co app of dfts from judgt of Mr Justice Mathew, dated Jan 12, 1898, at trial without a jury, Middlesex Feb 11
A C Watson v J H Holmes (Crown Side) app of plt from judgt of Justices Grantham and Channell, dated Dec 17, 1897 Feb 11
C E Reynolds, &c (next friend) **v H L Holloway** (Crown Side) app of plt from judgt of Justices Day & Lawrance, dated Jan 18, 1898 Feb 11
The City of London Brewery Co ld, applts v The Commrs of Inland Revenue, respts (Revenue) app of applts from judgt of Justices Grantham and Channell, dated Dec 14, 1897 Feb 12
Bonner & anr v Tottenham & Edmonton Permanent Investment Building Soc app of plts from judgt of Mr Justice Channell, dated Feb 7, 1898, at trial without a jury, Middlesex Feb 12
Crane v Bevan (Sheppard, 3rd party) app of dft from jdgt of Mr Justice Channell, dated Feb 9, 1898, at trial without a jury, Middlesex Feb 15
Bennett (wife, &c) v Slater & anr app of plt from jdgt of Mr Justice Matthew, dated Jan 26, 1898, at trial without a jury, Middlesex Feb 15
Brown v Sharpington app of dft from jdgt of Mr Justice Channell, dated Jan 25, 1895, at trial without a jury, Middlesex Feb 17
Taylor & anr v Geary app of deft from jdgt of Mr Justice Ridley, dated Feb 8, 1898, at trial without a jury, Middlesex Feb 18
Boaler v Wertheimer, Lea, & Co app of ptf fin person from jdgt of The Lord Chief Justice, dated Feb 1, 1898, at trial with special jury, Middlesex (security ordered) Feb 22
Rolls v Prell & ors app of dfts from jdgt of Mr Justice Mathew, dated Feb 16, 1898, at trial without a jury, Middlesex Feb 23
Tregillus v Spillers & Bakers ld app of plt from jdgt of Mr Justice Darling, dated Feb 10, 1898, at trial with special jury, Winchester Feb 23
Pash & ors v Keays app of dft from jdgt of Mr Justice Wright, dated Feb 1, 1898, at trial without a jury, Middlesex Feb 28
Way v Young app of dft from jdgt of Mr Justice Bigham, dated Feb 22, 1898, at trial without a jury, Middlesex March 2
Shipway v Broadwood app of dft from jdgt of Mr Justice Day, dated Feb 10, 1898, Worcester March 2
Ford v Chichester app of plt from judgt of Mr. Justice Mathew, dated Jan 21, 1898, at trial without a jury, Middlesex March 7
Martin v Martin & Co & ors Martin v Martin & Co (consolidated) app of F Trischler from judgt of Mr Justice Channell, dated Feb 15, 1898, at trial without a jury, Middlesex (security ordered) March 8
Neale v Neale app of plt from judgt of Mr. Justice Vaughan Williams, dated 21, 1897, at trial without a jury, Birmingham March 10
Hunter v Tebay app of plt from judgt of Mr Justice Bruce, dated Dec 7, 1897, at trial with special jury, Lancaster, and cross notice of deft, dated March 10, 1898 March 11
Watkins (trustee, &c) **v Lindsay & Co** app of plt from judgt of Mr Justice Wright, dated Feb 24, 1898, at trial without a jury, Middlesex March 12
Palmer & Co ld v Muir app of plt from judgt of Mr Justice Bigham, dated March 3, 1898, at trial without a jury, Middlesex March 16
Martin & anr v Raffety app of deft from judgt of Mr Justice Wright, dated March 5, 1898, at trial without a jury, Middlesex March 16
House & Land Investment Trust ld & ors v Estcourt app of plts from judgt of Mr Justice Wills, dated March 4, 1898, at trial without a jury, Middlesex March 17
Pneumatic Tyre Co ld v Leicester Pneumatic Tyre Co app of defts from judgt of Mr Justice Kennedy, dated March 5, 1898, at trial without a jury March 17
Owners of the Wool Cargo lately on board the SS "Waikato" v New Zealand Shipping Co ld app of dfts from judgt of Mr Justice Bigham, dated March 4, 1898, at trial without jury, Middlesex March 18
Lower Rhine & Wurthenburg Insce Assoc v Sedgwick app of plts from judgt of Mr Justice Kennedy, dated Feb 11, 1898, at trial without jury, Middlesex March 18
The Valveless Gas Engine Syndicate ld v Day app of plts from judgt of Mr Justice Bigham, dated March 1, 1898 March 19
Roberts & ors v Thomas & ors app of dfts from judgt of Mr Justice Wright, dated March 12, 1898 March 22
Foxwell & ors v Van Grutten app of plts from judgt of Mr Justice Bigham, dated March 17, 1898 March 24
Winton (in forma pauperis) v Price app of plt from judgt of Mr Justice Darling, dated March 9, 1898 March 25
Chapman v Harding Bros app of dfts from judgt of Mr Justice Darling, dated Feb 24, 1898 March 25
Seaton v Keats & ors app of A Batley, a dft, from judgt of Mr Justice Day, dated March 16, 1898, at trial without a jury, Middlesex March 28
Duxbury v Sandiford (Crown Side) app of dft from judgt of Justices Wright & Darling, dated March 18, 1898 March 30
The Venezuela Central Ry Co, ld v The Construction Investment Co, ld app of dfts from judgt of Mr Justice Wright, dated March 8, 1898, at trial without a jury, Middlesex March 30
Bue v Bywater app of dft from judgt of Mr Justice Day, dated March 22, 1898, at trial without a jury, Middlesex March 30
Stanley v Mumford app of dft from judgt of Mr Justice Day, dated March 21, 1898, at trial without a jury, Middlesex March 31
McGuffie v Burleigh app of dft from judgt of Mr. Justice Bruce, dated March 24, 1895, Middlesex (jury discharged) March 31
Foster v Simpson app of plt from judgt of Mr Justice Bigham, dated March 31, 1898, at trial without a jury, Middlesex March 31
Greenwood v Francis app of dft from judgt of Mr Justice Day, dated March 18, 1898, at trial without a jury, Middlesex March 31
Hall v Cox app of plt from judgt of Mr Justice Lawrance, dated March 23, 1898, West Riding, York April 2
Thomson & anr v Edwards app of applts from judgt of Mr Justice Grantham, dated March 22, 1898, at trial without a jury, Middlesex April 4
Miller v Harding app of plt from judgt of Mr Justice Grantham, dated March 31, 1898 April 5
Turner v Bowles Bowles v Turner & anr (by counter-claim) app of E & C A Turner from judgt of Mr Justice Channell, dated Feb 1, 1898, at trial without a jury, Middlesex April 5
Field SS Co ld v Burr app of plts from judgt of Mr Justice Bigham, dated March 22, 1898, at trial without a jury, Middlesex April 5
Newby v Eckersley app of dft from judgt of Mr Justice Lawrance, dated March 25, 1898, and common jury, Leeds April 5
A Jones (wife of E J Jones), **plt v The Barking Urban District Council, dfts** (Crown Side) app of plt from judgt of Justices Wright and Darling, dated March 17, 1898 April 5
The Southwark & Vauxhall Water Co, appls v The Hampton Urban District Council, respts (Crown Side) app of respts from judgt of Justices Wright & Darling, dated March 18, 1898 April 5
The Queen on the Prosecution of R B Moore v M T Shore (Crown Side) app of prosecutors from judgt of Justices Wright & Darling, dated March 25, 1898 April 6
Webster v Barnett & Son app of dfts from judgt of The Lord Chief Justice, dated March 24, 1898, at trial without a jury, Birmingham April 6
The Insce Co of North America v The North China Insce Co app of plts from judgt of Mr Justice Bigham, dated March 31, 1898 April 6
Porter v Mulholland app of dft from judgt of Mr Justice Darling, dated March 23, 1898, at trial with common jury, Middlesex April 6
Finch v Woodrow app of plt from judgt of Mr Justice Wills, dated March 28, 1898, at trial with common jury, Middlesex April 7
Fleming & Galbraith v L'Esperance Assce Co app of dfts from judgt of Mr Justice Kennedy, dated Feb 18, 1898, at a trial without a jury, Middlesex April 7

HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE.

CHANCERY DIVISION.

EASTER SITTINGS, 1898.

(*Continued from p.* 438.)

Before Mr. Justice NORTH.
Causes for Trial (with witnesses).

In re Buckett Aldridge v Buckett act
Simmance v W Sugg & Co, ld act
Darby v London Agency, ld act
Delaunoy v The Hostabuch Copper Syndicate, ld act
Edison United Phonograph Co, &c, ld v Roberts act
Keates v Keates act & counter-claim
Reynolds v Biltcliffe act
Duhamel et Cie v Cunningham Egg Fruit Co act
Ellis v Churly act
Goode v Bridgwater & Co act
Banister v Landon act
Burr v Sir J Pitman & Sons ld act without pleadings
Holford v Blaiberg act (pleadings to be delivered)
Davis v White Cliffs Opal Mines ld act
White Cliffs Opal Mines ld v Davis act (transferred from Q B Division)
Inskip v Horwood act
Leigh v Baron de L'Isle act
Poney v Hordern act & m f j
The London Property Investment Co ld v Shinalnicoff act
In re Waymouth Waymouth v Waymouth act
Willis v Aste act
The Improved Electric Glo Lamp Co v The Edison and Swan United Electric Light Co ld act
In re Joel & Fantas' Patent, No 23,111 of 1895, and Patents, &c, Acts ptn entered in Witness List
Shaw v Holland act
Kerfoot v Godlonton act
In re Graydon's Patents, No 18,007 of 1893 & No 16,927 of 1894 ptn entered in Witness List
Smith v Bridgwater act
Blair v Fuller's ld act
A Lawes ld v Goodchild act
South African Republic v La Compagnie Franco-Belge du Chemin de fer du Nord, &c act
Zumbeck v Bradford act
Stedman v Carpenter act & m f j
T P Lee & Co ld v T P Lee act
Paine v Clements act
Weymss v Knollys act & m f j
In re Elliott Milnes v Hare act
T E Brinsmead & Sons ld v Lomax act & m f j
Kemp v Lowenfeld act
Pankhurst v Reed act
Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Co ld v Wedge Pneumatic Tyre Co ld act
Bolton v Hall act
Collis v Gray act
Smith v Sharp act
Cox v Manuelle act
Tanton v Bull act
Urban District Council of Chiswick v Arnold (J Whitaker 3rd party) act
Irvine v Irvine & Co ld act
Mordecai v Crown act
Ross v Caseley act
In re Strickland Skarfe v Strick-

land adj sums entered in Witness List
Atkins v King act
Schwarz v Cape Colonization Co ld act
Maison Helbronner ld v Duveen act
The Provident Clerks', &c Assoc v Wilson act & m f j
Macarthur v Macarthur act & counter-claim
Chapman v Barnett act
Dunbar v Dunbar act
Whittle v Morris act
Walcott v Walcott act
Curre v Chepstow Water Co act
The Manchester Ship Canal Co v Company of Proprietors of Rochdale Canal act
Akeroyd v Morley act & counter-claim
Roche v Hobson act & m f j
Fleming v Loe act & counter-claim
Dingle v Coppen Coppen v Dingle act & counter-claim
Lax-nby v Shipp act & counter-claim
Holland v Chelsea Electricity Supply Co ld act without pleadings
Cox v Borthwick act
Wright v Davies act
Fitzgerald v Bransom, Kent, & Co, ld act
Chinnock v Rural District Council of Hartley Wintney act (pleadings to be delivered)
Figgess v Same act (without pleadings)
Phillips v Same act (without pleadings
Chandebois v Burry act
Royal Sovereign Gold Mining Co, ld v King act against dft T H Davis
Smith v Devon & Exeter Turkish Bath Co ld act
Pilley v Shaw act (without pleadings)
The Earl's Court Hotels ld v Evans act
The Tachytype Manufacturing Co Incorporated v The Monotype Machine British Patents Syndicate ld act
In re The Truffault Cycle & Tube, &c, Co ld & Co's Acts motn entered in Witness List
Barnett v Meekin act
The Salt Union, ld v Davis' Chloride Process, ld act
Wickham v Ogilvy act
Hart v Brie act
Parr v General Investors' Syndicate, ld act
Weston v Sewell act
Wells v Schofield act
In re Sheba, Queen, &c & Co's Acts motn entered in witness list by order
United, &c Tea Co, ld v Lipman act
Miller & Aldworth v Sharp act
Chadburn v Bladon act
Sellars v Dalley act
Gellygaer School Board v Llangynider School Board act
King v St Martin's Syndicate, ld act

Adjourned summonses.

In re Webb Knollys v Venn
In re McAlpin Magginson v Paterson
In re Wilson Cooke v Wilson
In re Lamb Clough v Arnold
Worsey v Baxter
In re Garnault Garnault v Garnault
The Whiteley Exerciser ld v Gamage
In re Emery Mollett v Mollett
In re Gray Dusantoy v Gray
In re Allen Bassett v Allen
In re King Savery v Bourne
In re Tucker Tucker v Tucker
In re Pickworth Snaith v Parkinson
In re Williams Williams v White
In re Whiteley St Paul v Robinson
In re Westwood Bunting v Westwood
In re Grove Grove v Braunstein
In re Ellis Ellis v Nicholls
In re Dixon Raimbach v Dixon
Coleman v Coleman
In re Blackler Blackler v Blackler
In re Clark Brown v Harkness
In re Wooler Wooler v Wooler
In re Gundry In re Mills Mills v Gundry
In re Same Mills v Mills
In re G Murdoch, &c
In re Day Day v Sprake
In re Meeson In re Geere Stokes v Geere
In re Procter Procter v Ellis
In re Joseph Davis' Charity, &c
In re Gray Gray v Gray
In re Rae Ferguson v Smith
In re Drage Drage v Drage
In re Waters & Nelson & V & P Act, 1874
Evans v Newfoundland Ry Co

Before Mr. Justice Stirling.

Causes for Trial (with witnesses).

Harward v Australian South African Gold Exploration Co ld act
Renouf v Spalding & Bros act
Williams v Wheeler act
Attorney-Gen v Radstock Urban District Council act
Barton v Beal act & counter-claim
Vilanova of Domenech v The Olot & Gerona Ry Co ld act
Armstrong v Croft act & counter-claim
In re Willcox Armitage v Pauling act
Mascias v Anglo-American Construction Co ld act
West v Harper act
Helios Electkricitats Actien Gesellschaft v Braulik act
Lord Hastings v North-Eastern Ry Co act
The Clerical, Medical & General Life Assce Co v Rogers act & m f j
Harper & Battcock v Lewis act
Horton v Redfern act (pleadings to be delivered)
Paynter v Galindez Bros act & counter-claim
Howson v Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Co ld act
Hoskin v J. Shoolbred & Co act
Shurey v Kinnis & Co act
Hanan v Lancaster Dramatic Syndicate ld act
Weed v George act
Allen v Pyatt & Co act (Birmingham D R)
Huntly-Gordon v Hall act
Bergheim v Bryan act & m f j
Brown v Harley act
Jones v Koral act
Gompertz (trading, &c.) v The Credit Reform Assoc act
Cooke v Ackroyd act
Peters v Owen act
Owen v Peters act
Williams v London & North Western Ry Co act
Wood v Middleton act (remitted from County Court of Whitehaven)
Colley v Otter act (without pleadings)
Barker v Oakden act
Bankes Price v Owen act
Lloyd v Powell act
Mansell v Mansell act
Terry v Brickwell act
Sleeman v Cragoe act
English & American Machinery Co ld v Hershowitz act
Bennett v Collins act
Martin v Martin act
Catling v Barnett act
In re W Owen's Patent, No 12,368 of 1896 petn ordered to go into witness list
Basset v Graydon act
Doolette v Coolgardie Mint, &c, Co ld act and counter claim
The City and Home Counties, &c, Building Soc v Came act & m f j (transferred from Kekewich, J)
Same v Same act & m f j
Mayer v Robert Church & Roberts act (security ordered)
Frederick v Young act & counter-claim
Cooper v Laurence act & m f j
Simms v Salomons act
Still v Cook act
Russell v Young act
Chingford Syndicate, ld v Andrews act
Graydon v Blackpool Gigantic Wheel Co, ld act
Pooler v Grant, Bulcraig & Co act
Fay v Clarion Newspaper Co, ld act
Burford v Burford act & counter-claim
In re Shorey Smith v Shorey act
Hind v Thompson act
Baker v Behrens act
Drincqbier v Wood act & motn for judgt
In re Griffin Griffin v Griffin act
Booth v Australian Mines Agency ld act
Keynes v Leslie & Co ld act
Hett v Carpenter act
Babington v Worrall act & counter-claim
In re Wortham Wortham v Wortham act (not before May 1)
Tubeless Pneumatic Tire, &c ld v French Tubeless Tyre Co ld act (Birmingham D R)
Hart v Mattoy act
Manfield v Rose act & m f j
In re Evans Jones v Jones adjd sumns entered in Witness List
In re Perry Davis v Volkman act
Budd v Pullman act
Dainfler Motor Co ld v Bowen act
Hiscott v Carter act
Hiscott v Short act
Whiteman v Hambourg act
Chancerelle v Ratcliffe act
Winser & Co ld v Armstrong & Co act
Richards v Kerbey act
Mathews v Wilmer act (pleadings to be delivered)
In re Pickworth Pickworth v Pickworth adj smns to be treated as action for trial
Maryon v Motum act
Peter v Godfrey act
The Windermere Gas, &c. Co v Crosthwaite act
Carter Gear Case Patents Co v Elswick Cycles Co ld act
Bew v Bew act
Abbs v Matheson & Co act set down against dfts Matheson & Co
King v Keen act
Peters v The Owen Stone Co ld act
Bovey v Day act
Williams v The Rhymney Iron Co act
Pulteyne v Aldous act
Lord Battersea v Clement's Inn ld act
Australian Mines Agency ld v McKay act & m f j (transferred from North, J)
White v Briley act
Hannan v Murgatroyd act
Reid v Houldsworth act
Tweedale v Ashworth act
In re Mackey Davison v Turner act
Emmerson & Sons v North act
Tomlinson v Sandford & Willett act
W Edge & Sons ld v Gallon & Son act (pleadings to be delivered)
Fowke v Haynes act
Russell v Clare Estate Syndicate ld act
Gibson v Licensed Trade Protectorate ld act
Lord Royston v Turkish Regie Export Co ld act

Causes for Trial (without witnesses) and Adjourned Summonses.

In re Watkins Maybery v Maybery adjd sumns
Barker v Faulkner act set down by order
In re Morgan Morris v Morgan adjd sums
In re Cuthbert Cuthbert v Cuthbert adjd sumns
In re Ansley West v Allman adjd sumns
In re Bishop Bishop v Macey adjd sumns
In re Jackson King v Hamblett adj sumns
In re Wright De Chair v Garnett adj sumns
In re Sadler Bubb v Surman adj sumns
Denman v Batten (surcharge, dated Nov 18, 1897)
In re Prince Godwin v Prince adj sumns
In re Haden Cooling v Haden adj sumns
Bailey v Bullock m f j
Astbury v Astbury adj query on account
In re Davey Davey v Greenfield adj sumns
In re Mackenzie Watson v Hodgson adj sumns
Aluminium Co ld v Domeier & Co adj sumns
Nixon v Tasker m f j (short)
In re Owen Peat v Owen adj sumns
Collier v Coxhead m f j (short)
Sharp v Sharp m f j (short)
In re Oldfield Oldfield v Oldfield adj sumns

Further Considerations.

In re Alexander Swanston v Alexander fur con & two adjd sumns
In re Alexander Hodges v Alexander fur con
In re Pitkin Pitkin v H M Treasury fur con restored by order

Before Mr. Justice Kekewich.

Causes for Trial (with witdesses).

Jacobs v Wicks' Rotary Type Casting Co ld act (Trinity Sittings)
Fisher v Gilbey act
Clark v Wood act
Morgan v Howells act
Bostock v Horton act & m f j
Matthews v Armstrong act
Cull v Leader act
Bennett v Hudson act
Hopkins v Hemsworth act
Taylor v Martin act (deft dead)
The Mica Insulator Co v The Electrical Co ld act
Holloway v Haviland act
Matthews v Matthews act
De Hem v Phipps act
Gilbert v Wheaton act
De Lissa v Universal Weldless Steel Tubes Co, &c ld act and counter claim

Taylor v Morris act
Watkins v Cronmire act without pleadings and adjd sumns
Watson v Jennings act
Nall v Nall act
Blew-Jones v Cook act
Cooper v Floate act
Terry v Bates act
Zumbeck v Biggs act
Count Mokronoski v Weldon & Corby Patent Brick Co ld act without pleadings (April 19)
Bisseker v Nurcombe act and m f j
Purcell v Chinnock act
Armstrong v Coolgardie Mint & Iron King Gold Mines ld (in liquidation) act
Brocklebank v Shepherd, the younger act
Denny v Robson act
Bywaters v Wilde act & m f j
Woodd v Coolgardie Mint & Iron King Gold Mines ld act

Before Mr. Justice ROMER.

Causes for Trial (with witnesses).

Brady v Hannan's Gold Estates ld act
Ridlington v Haydon act
Symonds v Bellman act
Chevallier v Carter act (advanced by order)
Smith v Brookes act
Congreve v North Wales & Liverpool Ry Committee act
Silverthorne v Link act
In re Birch Kent v Pettitt act
Wilson v Insurances Corporation ld act
Price Fothergill v Urquhart act (not before May 3)
Lewis v Newman act
Hazeldine v Farrant act
De Witte v Addison act, counterclaim, & m f j
Levy v Davis act
Thomas v Penley act
Barnes v De Montmort act (stayed until return of Commission)
Montagu v Gater act
In re Chard Chard v Chard act
In re The Marie Rose Gold Mining Co ld & Co's Acts (expte Rawson) motn ordered to go into Witness List
In re The Same (expte Brand) transferred from Stirling, J.
In re Bull Wenn v Bull adjd sumns entered in Witness List
In re The Sharkington Combined Pick & Shovel Syndicate ld motn entered in Witness List
Truman, Hanbury, Buxton & Co ld v Reeve act
Anderson v Anderson act
Jackson v Horner act without pleadings
Sulley v Sulley act
Mawby v Parker act
Bates v Chignell act
Priestley v Oxley act
Hobbs v Mills act
Mayor, &c. of Newcastle on Tyne v Houseman act
Same v Francis act
Cheasley v Cheston act
Chetwynd v Allen act
Heelis v Warriner act
Scott v Crossley act
Nat Prov Bank of England ld v Tominy act
In re Mallam Mallam v Mallam act
Roe v Roe act & counter-claim
In re Von Hangwitz Von Hangwitz v Von Hangwitz act
Pickstock v Earle act
Browne v Calnan act
Becher v Davey act
Joyce v Freeman act
Franklin v Lee act
In re Hale Lilley v Foad adjd sums ordered to go into Witness List
Meikle v Curd act
Guilford v Hart act
Harvey v Greig act
Evelyn v Howard act (without pleadings)
P Philpot & Co, ld v Ward act
Weaver v Jenner act (pleadings to be delivered)
Baker v Dix & Warlow act
Hockey v Self-Locking Roofing Tile Co, ld act & m f j
Everitt v Grout act
Attorney-Gen v Society Established for Relief, &c of Theatre Royal, Covent Garden act
Coleman v North act
Wilkins & Denton v Cruley act
Duke v Bayly act
Burlinson v Spry act
Cowen v Truefitt, ld act
Mackney v Oakes act
Barrett v Barbean act & counterclaim
Strangways v Read act
Morgan v Lord Gort act
In re Miller's & Co Margarine, ld & Co's Acts motn entered in witness list
Vernon v Billson act
Seddon v Pakeman act
Waller v Outhwaite act
Wallach v Evans act
Heaton v Priestman act
Brassington v Cox act
In re The Mines Acquisition, &c, Co, ld Clement v Mines, &c, ld act
Levy v Sawer act
Friary, Holroyd's & Healy's Breweries, ld v Singleton act
The Carter Gear Case Patents Co v Sander act
Toms v Clacton Urban District Council act without pleadings
In re Brown In re Tilley Button v Taylor act
In re Wicken Wicken v Few act & m f j
In re G Cerckel's Patent, 1896, No 15,493, &c petn entered in Witness List
Starkey v Jones act
Baker v Brooks act
Fabriques de Produits Chimiques, &c v Laffitte & Co act
In re Sinnette's Patent, No 1,670 of 1888 petn entered in Witness List
Wanton v Coppard act
Smeeton v Styer act
Shuter v Godwin act
Hughes v Smith act
Oliver v Hinton act
King v Mendham act without pleadings
Mills v Allen act
Hobbs v Allen act (advanced by order)
Moon v Waterlow, Bros & Layton ld act
In re Welsford Welsford v Welsford act
Economides v Morris act
Marsh v Moody act
Bouchette v Ballard act
In re M Smith Smith v Scorer act
In re Ball Ball v Ball act
Rogers v Hale act & counterclaim
Bryant v Glover act
Day v Singleton act (transferred from North, J)
Haywood v Tolhurst act
Richardson v Moody act & counterclaim
McCulloch v Chantry act
Pyke v Grafton Galleries ld act
Oldham v Showell's Brewery Co ld act
Mountain v Kidd act
Hayes v New Incandescent, &c Gas Co ld act
Dewrance & Co v Fletcher Bros act
Hadley v Corporation of Worcester Act
Brooke v Higgs act
In re Crompton & Shawcross ld & Co's Act, 1862 (Expte G Ratcliffe) motion set down in witness list
In re Parker Maughan v Clark act
Lazonby v Clinton act & m f j
Martin v McCarthy act
Shaw v Goldsbro act
Smith v Rothman act without pleadings
In re Trade Marks, Nos 189,368, 193,011 and 193,012, class 45, of F & J Smith, &c motn entered in witness list to come on with act
Warburg, Dymond & Co v Scott & Co ld act
Apostoloff v The Apostoloff Automatic Telephone, &c ld act
In re The Gutta Percha Corporation ld & Co's Act, 1862 motn entered in witness list by order
Payton & Co, ld v Snelling, Lampard & Co ld act
Philpot v Rudham act
The East Surrey Water Co v Taylor act
The Sutton District Water Co v Taylor act
Santley v Wilde act
Molyneux v Bond act
Vincett v Harrison act
The Automatic Air Tight Co ld v The Hermetically Sealed Jar Syndicate ld act
Gillson v Seiter act without pleadings
Hart v Murray act
Smith v Jones & Son, ld act
Beardmore v Interchangeable Automatic Machine Syndicate ld act without pleadings

Causes for Trial.

(Without Witnesses and Adjourned Summonses).

In re White's Charities The Charity Commrs v the Mayor, &c, of London adjd smns
Augus & Co ld v Goss act set down by order
In re Nicholson Nicholson v Nicholson adjd smns
In re Ritson Ritson v Ritson adjd sumns
In re Low Slocomb v Low adjd sumns
In re Vincent In re Sutherland Farrer v Vincent adjd sumns
In re Smith Loughran v Smith adjd sumns
In re Bacon Forster v Jones adjd sumns
In re Malkin Malkin v Malkin adjd sumns
North Met Trams Co v London County Council adjd sumns
In re L Tussaud's New Exhibition ld Brown v Norton adjd sumns
In re G Lock & Co ld & Co's Act motn to rectify entered in Non-Witness List
In re Clark Brown v Clark adjd sumns
In re Bennett Goodall v Bennett adjd sumns
In re Sansom Freeman v Sansom adjd sumns (witnesses)

Before Mr. Justice WRIGHT.

(Sitting as an additional Judge of the Chancery Division.)

Companies (Winding-up).

Petitions.

Gold Reefs of Western Australia ld (petn of G E D Durnford)
Liberty Consolidated Gold Mines ld (petn of C Frey)
North Borneo Prospecting & Cultivation Syndicate ld (petn of W P R Newlands)
British Gold Fields of West Africa ld (petn of C W Cornmell)
Bonara Italian Steel and Tin Plate Manufacturing Co ld (petn of G O A Sommer)
Globe Blocks Mining Co ld (scheme of arrangement) (petn of C J Fauvel and the South African and Australian Exploration & Development Syndicate ld)
London & Paris Finance & Exploration Co, ld (petn of Reservoir Hub & Components Co, ld)
Spiller & Co, ld (petn of W Klingenstein & Co)
Same (petn of W H Lowry & Co)
Wheel Club, ld (petn of H J Grimwade)
West Australian Pastoral & Colonization Co, ld (petn of Land Corpn of West Australia, ld)
Umtoli Gold Reefs Co, ld (petn of R G Bagshawe & ors)
Abercorn Reefs, ld (petn of A Legge & ors)
North Golden Crown, ld (petn of White Feather Reward Claim, ld)
Oriental Palace of Varieties, ld (petn of Shelley & Co, ld)
United Kingdom Debenture Bank, ld (petn of The Agence Havas)
Menzies Golden Rhine Gold Mines (W A), ld (petn of W J Cambridge)
South Australian Petroleum Fields, ld (petn of J Senior)
National Co for the Distribution of Electricity by Secondary Generators, ld (petn of H O Ruelle)
Realization & Development Co, ld (petn of F L Gardner)
Walker & Smith, ld (petn of F Godson & ors)
Ariel Arc Lamp Syndicate ld (petn of M J Jones and ors)
Coolgardie Mint & Iron King Gold Mines, ld (petn of A Watters)
Pentalta Exploration Co, ld (petn of Victoria Reef Gold Mine, ld & A Myall, one of the liquidators)
Beeston Pneumatic Tyre Co, ld (petn of The Company and W O Clough, liquidator)
Metropolitan & Provincial Stores, ld (petn of the company)
Devon United Slate Quarries, ld (petn of J Hardcastle)
National Guardian Assce Co, ld (petn of F C Norman)
Hunwick & Co, ld (petn of H W Caston & Co)
Brown, Michel, & Page, ld (petn of F Broom)
Bass & Flinders Gold Mining Co, ld (petn of D New & Co)
Improved Electro-Plating Co., ld (petn of La Societe de Metallurgie Hydro-Electro-Chimique)
Ryder & Co ld (petn of Pfeil & Co
Wulffsohn & Bewicke ld (petn of Moodyville Lands and Saw Mills Co ld and W G Jeffreys the liquidator)
Licensed Trades Protectorate ld (petn of F W West)
African India Rubber, Mahogany & Development Co ld (petn of W R Horncastle)
Industrial Inventions Development Co ld (petn of the Globe Venture Syndicate ld)

HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE.

QUEEN'S BENCH DIVISION.

EASTER SITTINGS, 1898.

SPECIAL PAPER.

For Argument.

In re an Arbtn between Gubbins & anr and The London and Blackwall Ry Co and The Great Eastern Railway Co s o referred to Arbitrator special case
In re an Arbitn between Spillers & Bakers, ld, and H Leetham & Sons s o for case to be stated in form of award special case
In re an Arbitration between George and The Goldsmiths & General Burglary Insurance Assoc, ld special case
In re an Arbitn between Llanwanno School Board and Ystradyfodwg School Board special case
Davis v The Urban District Council of Witney points of law
In re an Arbitn between Fish and The Lancashire and Yorkshire Ry Co and London and North-Western Ry Co special case

OPPOSED MOTIONS.

For Argument.

Ball v Williams part heard s o for further report
In re a Solicitor, Expte Incorporated Law Soc s o report referred back
In re a Solicitor, Expte Same s o for further report
Chiverton v Chiverton s o
Deakin v Cohen s o August 1
Perfecta Seamless Steam Tube Co v Wood Bros
Hackett v Hackett
St John v Mitchell's Library, ld

CROWN PAPER.

For Judgment.

Kent Kruse v Johnson magistrate's case (c.a.v. April 4, 1898—coram, Lord Russell, C.J., the President of the P D & A Division, Chitty, L.J., and Mathew, Wright, Darling, & Channell, JJ)
Richmond, Surrey Coppen v Moore magistrate's case (c.a.v. April 4, 1898—coram, Lord Russell, C.J., the President of the P D & A Division, Chitty, L.J., and Wright, Darling, & Channell, JJ)
Middlesex, Edmonton Davey & Co v Williamson & Son (Richards, clmt) county court clmt's app (c.a.v. March 31, 1898—coram, Lord Russell, C.J., & Mathew, J)
Cornwall, Truro Rundle v Hearle county court dft's app (c.a.v. April 5, 1898—coram, Lord Russell, C.J., & Ridley, J)

For Argument.

Pembrokeshire The Queen v Mayor, &c, of Pembroke, (expte Local Government Board) Nisi for mandamus to obey order of Local Government Board
Met Pol Dist Kirshenboim v Salmon & Gluckstein magistrate's case
Yorkshire, W R W Riding of Yorkshire Rivers Board & anr v Goldthorpe & anr app from Quarter Sessions, under sec 14, sub-sec 2, of the West Riding of Yorkshire Rivers Act, 1894
Dorsetshire Brown v Patch magistrate's case
Warwickshire, Birmingham Watkins v Rubber Tyre, &c Co county court dft's app
Same Watkins v Rubber Tyre, &c. Co county court plt's app
Middlesex, Brompton Thomas v Corbett & ors county court dft's app
Glamorganshire, Merthyr Tydfil Re Bernstein, dec, Fine & ors v Bernstein & ors county court plts' app
Birmingham Blundell v Price magistrate's case
Met Pol Dist Geen v Newington Vestry magistrate's case
Cheshire Baxter v Leche & ors quarter sessions special case applt's app
Lancashire, Liverpool Welsby v Mayor, &c. of Liverpool plt's app
Surrey, Redhill Bigden v Eden county court dft's app
Essex, Brentwood Horner v Lewis county court plt's app
West Ham Kennaird v Cory & Son magistrate's case
Kingston-upon-Hull Cartwright v Sculcoate's Union quarter sessions case stated by arbitration on submission of parties and order of judge of High Court, 12 & 12 Vict. c. 45, s 11 and s 7 Arbitration Act, 1889
Same Willford v Same The same
Same Walsh v Same The same
Same Robinson v Same The same
London Richards v Luning mayor's court dft's app
Met Pol Dist Roper v Knott magistrate's case
Middlesex, Brompton Jones v Hawker (Hawker, clmt) county court clmt's app
Leicestershire Leicester County Council v Leicester Assessment Committee quarter sessions special case, 12 & 13 Vict. c. 45, s 11
Surrey Lancaster v Barnes Urban District Council magistrate's case
Lancashire, Ashton-under-Lyne London & North-Western Ry Co v Evans county court plts' app
Middlesex, Shoreditch Herbert & Co v Morrison (Worley, on behalf, &c, clmts) county court clmts' app
Cheshire, Macclesfield Ibeson v Darlow county court dft's app
Glamorganshire, Neath Jones v Jones county court dft's app
Warwickshire The Queen v Ashton Urban District Council (expte Barber) Nisi for mandamus to approve plans
Chepping Wycombe orse High Wycombe Mayor, &c, of High Wycombe v Conservators of River Thames magistrate's case
Met Pol Dist Blenkinsopp v Ogden, Smale, & Co magistrate's case
Somersetshire, Temple Cloud Irvine v Gough County court dft's app
Sussex, Worthing Cuckfield Rural District Council v Goring County court dft's appeal
Lancashire The Queen v Pilkington & ors, Jj, &c, and Wallace (expte Williams) Nisi for certiorari for licence to J Wallace
Same The Queen v Cotham, Esq, & anr, Jj, &c, and Webb (expte Williams) Nisi for certiorari for transfer of licence to J Webb
Same The Queen v Cotham, Esq, & anr, Jj, (expte Williams) Nisi for mandamus to hear application for transfer of licence to J. Webb
Lancashire, Liverpool Orchard v Bush & Co County court dfts' app
Essex Taylor & ors v Jackson magistrate's case
Warwickshire The Queen v London & North-Western Ry Co (expte Rugby Portland Cement Co) Nisi for mandamus to take up award
Met Pol Dist Graham v Eli magistrate's case
Same Same v Hughes magistrate's case
Same Same v Same magistrate's case
Met Pol Dist Graham v Hughes magistrate's case
Same Same v Same magistrate's case
Same Same v Barlow magistrate's case
Same Crosse v Wandsworth Board of Works magistrate's case
Yorkshire, W R Prior v Slaithwaite Spinning Co magistrate's case
Met Pol Dist Petchey v Taylor magistrate's case
Kent, Woolwich Wilkins v Thomas & Edge county court defts' app
Middlesex Button v Tottenham Urban District Council magistrate's case
Southampton Dallimore v Tutton magistrate's case
Sussex Kinnis v Graves magistrate's case
Yorkshire, Kingston-upon-Hull Dorey v Crossland county court dft's app
Middlesex, Bloomsbury City and Home Counties Permanent Building Soc v Came county court dft's app
Kent River Medway Navigation Co v Malling Union quarter sessions special case, 12 & 13 Vic. c. 45, s. 11
Middlesex, Clerkenwell Thrussell v Hart county court dft's app
Cumberland, Cockermouth & Workington Marrow v Flimsby & Broughton Moor Coal, &c, Co county court dft's app
Met Pol Dist Leggatt (on behalf, &c) v Peach magistrate's case
London Newstead v Curtis county court deft's app
Staffordshire Horton & Son v Walsall Union & ors quarter sessions special case appellants' app
Lancashire, Bolton Shuttleworth v Harwood county court plt's app
Middlesex, Whitechapel Brooks v Curled Hair Fibre Co county court plt's app
Staffordshire, West Bromwich Wood v Monk & Newell county court defts' app
Lancashire, Bury Hall v Spencer & Curedale county court plt's app
Middlesex, Clerkenwell West v Dearing & Son county court plt's app
Salford Shafts v Cowen hundred court plt's app
Lincolnshire Horn v Sleaford Union & ors quarter sessions special case, 12 & 13 Vict c 45, s 11
Middlesex, Westminster Collings & anr v Corke county court deft's app
Middlesex, Brompton Foat v Fulham Vestry county court defts' app
Nottinghamshire, Mansfield Whitney v Crisp county court plt's app
Berkshire, Faringdon Clark & anr v Rochussen & Asprey county court plts' app
Surrey, Lambeth Fairhead v Appleby & anr county court plt's app
Cornwall, Launceston Rendell v Stoke Climsland School Board county court plt's app
Middlesex, Marylebone Boyce & ors v Chaplin & anr county court plts' app
London Lockie v Hosegood mayor's court deft's app
Middlesex, Brompton Willett v Thaddeus (Thaddeus, clmt) county court claimant's app
Surrey, Lambeth Hyde (trading, &c) v Coomber & anr county court dft Alfred Coomber's app
Middlesex, Whitechapel Burchett v London & India Docks Joint Committee county court plt's app
South Shields The Queen v Wardle & ors, Esqs, Jj, & The Horton Coal Co (expte Burrows) nisi to justices to state case
London The Queen v Tristram, D C L, judge of London Consistory Court (expte Young) nisi for prohibition for licence or faculty
Kent Bowron & anr v Bexley Overseers & ors quarter sessions special case appellants' app
Middlesex, Clerkenwell Meill v Cooper (Miell, clmt) county court dft's app
Somersetshire The Queen v Fry & anr, jj & Stoker (expte Masters) nisi for certiorari for conviction
Middlesex, Westminster Chandler v Scott & Co county court ptf's app
Met Pol Dist The Queen v Sheil, Esq, Met Pol Mag & Collins (expte Medical Council) Nisi to hear and determine application
Worcestershire Millard v Wilkinson & anr quarter sessions special case applt's app
Yorkshire, N R North Eastern Ry Co v Dalton Overseers quarter sessions special case applt's app
Carnarvonshire London & North Western Ry Co v Ogwen District Council
Met Pol Dist Paynter v Watson
Middlesex, Westminster Jenkins & Son v Coomber & ors
Middlesex, Shoreditch Mason v Taylor

REVENUE PAPER.

For Hearing.

Causes by English Information.

Attorney-Gen and Earl Cowley
Attorney-Gen and The Duke of Westminster & ors
Attorney-Gen and The South Eastern Ry & ors

Petitions.

Re The Royal College of Surgeons
Re Estate Duty payable on the death of The Rt Hon Lady Mary C F Foley

Cases as to Stamp Duty and Income Tax.

Farmer and Co, ld and The Commissioners of Inland Revenue
Grimes and Lethem (Surveyor of Taxes)
The County Council of the County of Cumberland and The Commissioners of Inland Revenue
Lewis & Lewis and The Commissioners of Inland Revenue
The Old Battersea & District 633rd Starr Bowkett Building Society and The Commissioners of Inland Revenue

THE PROPERTY MART.

SALES OF THE ENSUING WEEK.

May 2.—Mr. J. W. Kemsley, at the Mart, at 2 p.m., Freehold Ground-rents of £300 per annum, secured property in Croydon, Plaistow, &c., with reversion in 65 to 98 years. Solicitors, Messrs. Stacpoole, Batters, & Stacpoole, London. (See advertisement, this week, p. 3.)

May 3.—Messrs. DEBENHAM, TEWSON, FARMER, & BRIDGEWATER, at the Mart, at 2 p.m., Freehold Ground-rent with Reversion in about 10 years, secured upon important business and dwelling-houses in Camberwell, estimated rack-rent £1,300 per annum. Freehold Ground-rent of £12, £36 15s., and £44 2s., with reversion in 1984, secured upon pro perty in Camberwell; also Freehold Houses in the same district, let at £322 Solicitors, Messrs. Cridland & Neil, London. (See advertisements, April 16, p. 3.)

May 4.—Messrs. DOUGLAS YOUNG & Co., at the Mart, at 2 p.m., Long Leasehold Investment in property situated at East Ham, Ilford, &c. Solicitor, H. S. Woodd, Esq., London. Leasehold double fronted Residence, 13, Fernshaw-road, Chelsea; 12 rooms; let at £70. Solicitors, Messrs. Riddell, Vaisey, & Smith, 9, John-street, Bedford-row. Short Leasehold Premises, 313, New North-road, Hoxton; Shop and bakehouse, six rooms; let at £45 per annum. Solicitors, Messrs. Pettiver & Pearkes, 21, College-hill, E.C. Corner block, 14 and 15, Oxford House, Great Chapel-street, Oxford-street, comprising 3 shops and 9 suites of residential flats over; let at £584. Solicitors, Messrs. Riddell, Vaisey, & Smith, 9, John-street, Bedford-row, W.C. Leasehold properties in Balham and South Lambeth, producing about £1,000 per annum. Solicitors, Messrs. Hubbard, Son, & Eve, London; also on the estate at Thames Ditton, 54 Freehold Building Plots with frontages of 40 to 60 feet. Solicitors, Messrs. Geo. S. Warmington & Co., London. (See advertisement, April 23, p. 4.)

May 4.—Messrs. ALFRED SAVILL & SON, at the Mart, at 2 p.m., Freehold Residential Property at Loughton, Essex, about two miles from Loughton Station on the Great Eastern Railway, known as the Debden Hall Estate; it comprises Debden Hall, containing 19 bed and dressing rooms, 5 reception rooms, a park, with lodge, in all about 140 acres, with extensive frontages to main roads. A Freehold Residence, facing the Green. A Pair of Villas, a Pair of timber and tiled Cottages, and a small paddock. Solicitors, Messrs. Alfred Cox & Son, London. (See advertisement, this week, p. 402.)

May 5.—Messrs. H. E. FOSTER & CRANFIELD, at the Mart, at 2 p.m.:

REVERSIONS:
To £2,154 2½ Consols; lady aged 48. Solicitors, Messrs. Woodcock, Ryland, & Parker, London.
To one-fourth of £10,000 on Freehold Mortgage and East India Stock; lady aged 54 and gentleman aged 63. Solicitor, H. Stanley-Jones, Esq., London.
To one-fifth of a Trust Estate value £22,000 in American Stock; lady aged 60. Solicitor, H. Stanley-Jones, Esq., London.
To Six Forty-Thirds of a Trust Estate, Commercial Stocks and on Mortgage, value £19,200; lady aged 61. Solicitor, C. J. R. Scudamore, Esq., London.

REVERSIONARY LIFE INTEREST:
Lady aged 25, on decease of 2 gentlemen aged 76 and 51, in the income of £5,000, with policies to cover same. Solicitors, Messrs. Rogers Hartley, & Bastard, London.

POLICIES:
For £7,000, £1,000, £1,000, £262, £200. Solicitors, Messrs. Tamplin, Taylor, & Joseph, of London; Messrs. Darnell & Price; and Messrs. A. C. Palmer & Co., of Northampton.

SHARES:
Seven Shares in the "Graphic" and "Daily Graphic," and 500£1 Shares in Folkestone Racecourse Co. (See advertisements, this week, back page.)

WARNING TO INTENDING HOUSE PURCHASERS AND LESSEES.—Before purchasing or renting a house, have the Sanitary Arrangements thoroughly Examined, Tested, and Reported Upon by an Expert from Messrs. Carter Bros., 65, Victoria-street, Westminster. Fee quoted on receipt of full particulars. (Established 21 years.)—[ADVT.]

WINDING UP NOTICES.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, April 22.

JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

CORSAIR CONSOLIDATED GOLD MINES, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before June 10, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Sydney George Cole, 10, Coleman st. Armitage & Chapple, 18, Bishopsgate st Within, solors for liquidator

KAHOWNA PROPRIETARY DEVELOPMENT CO, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before May 19, to send in their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Edward Joseph Townsend, 25, Bucklersbury. Hurd, 25, Bucklersbury, solor

ROBERT YOUDE'S BILL-POSTING SYNDICATE, LIMITED—Creditors are requested, on or before May 15, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Alfred Cotton Harper, 10, Trinity sq, Tower hill. Eldred & Bignold, 11, Queen Victoria st, solors for liquidator

ST STEPHEN'S LAND AND BUILDING CO, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before May 28, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Edwin Mansfield, Whitby, Chester

UMTALI SYNDICATE, LIMITED (IN LIQUIDATION)—Creditors are required, on or before June 30, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to G G Walker, 19, St Swithin's lane

WIGTON FARMERS' AUCTION CO, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before June 4, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to William Williamson, West End, Allonby, nr Maryport. Gibson, Wigton, solor to the liquidators

UNLIMITED IN CHANCERY.

LA COMPAGNIE FRANCAISE DES ANTHRACITES DU PAYS DE GALLES—Petn for winding up, presented April 19, directed to be heard on Wednesday, May 4. White, 7, New inn, Strand, solor for petner. Notice of appearing must reach the above-named not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of May 3

COUNTY PALATINE OF LANCASTER.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

TIMBERLAKE & Co, LIMITED—Petn for winding up, presented April 19, directed to be heard before Hall, V.C., on Monday, May 2, at 10.30, at the Assize Courts, Manchester. Wilson Dean & McMaster, 22, Lord st, Liverpool, solors for the petners. Notice of appearing must reach the above-named not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of April 30

FRIENDLY SOCIETY DISSOLVED.

ARTIZANS' FRIENDLY SOCIETY, 35, Pzenest st, Hanley, Staffs. April 13

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, April 26.

JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

AFRICAN INDIARUBBER, MAHOGANY, AND DEVELOPMENT CO, LIMITED—Petn for winding up, presented April 7, directed to be heard May 4. Halse, Trustram, & Co, 61, Cheapside, solors for the petner Notice of appearing must reach the above-named not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of May 2

BRACEBRIDGE MINERAL WATER CO, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before May 27, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Charles Hodgkinson, 95, Colmore row, Birmingham

BRIGHTON EMPIRE, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before May 26, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Mr Frederick George Clark, 56, Ship st, Brighton. Nye & Treacher, solors for liquidator

COLONIAL EXPLORATIONS, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before June 10, to send their names and addresses, and particulars of their debts or claims, to Francis Turner, 11, Grocers' Hall ct, Poultry

ESCO BEEF JUICE CO, LIMITED (IN VOLUNTARY LIQUIDATION)—Creditors are required, on or before May18, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Elkanah Mackintosh Sharp, 120, Colmore row, Birmingham. Fowke & Son, Birmingham, solors to the liquidator

KINGSBURY (ST ALBANS) BREWERY CO, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before May 23, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Charles Jermyn Ford, 81, Cannon st Baker & Co, 117, Cannon st, solors for the liquidator

MELBOURNE AND LONDON PROSPECTORS, LIMITED—Petn for winding up, presented April 21, directed to be heard on May 4 Maddisons, 1, King's Arms yd, solors for petner Notice of appearing must reach the above-named not later than 6 o'clock on the afternoon of May 3

PENTALTA EXPLORATION CO, LIMITED—Petn for winding up, presented March 11, directed to be heard May 4. Ricketts & Co, 16, Charles st, St James', solors for the petitioning creditors. Notice of appearing must reach the above-named not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of May 3rd

SECRETARIAL CO, LIMITED—Creditors are requested, on or before May 31, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts and claims, to William Henry Fox, 9, Austin friars

TOM TIT CYCLE CO, LIMITED—Petn for winding up, presented April 21, directed to be heard on Wednesday, May 4. Everett & Hodgkinson, 124, Chancery lane, solors for petner. Notice of appearing must reach the above-named not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of May 3

FRIENDLY SOCIETIES DISSOLVED.

BERMONDSEY SICK CLUB, in connection with the NATIONAL, MUNICIPAL, AND VESTRY EMPLOYEES LABOUR UNION SOCIETY, 151, Abbey st, Bermondsey. April 20

BODMIN TRADESMAN'S FRIENDLY SOCIETY, Bodmin Coffee Tavern, Fore st, Bodmin April 20

EXCELSIOR WORKING MEN'S SICK CLUB, Mission Hall, Mansion House st, Hammersmith Feb 9

LOYAL GENTLE WELCOME SHEPHERDS, Ancient Shepherds A U Society, Blue Bell Inn, Bury, Lancaster April 13

BANKRUPTCY NOTICES.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, April 22.

RECEIVING ORDERS.

BALDRY, HENRY SHARMAN, Holt, Norfolk, Confectioner Norwich Pet April 18 Ord April 18

BARLOW, TOM, Brierfield, Lancs, Clothier Burnley Pet April 18 Ord April 18

BATESON, WILLIAM, Edgbaston, Joinery Manufacturer Birmingham Pet April 19 Ord April 19

BAXENDALE, Captain SIR, Hooley Hill, Lancs, Pawnbroker Ashton under Lyne Pet April 18 Ord April 18

BISHOP, ANN MARIA, Long Buckby, Northampton Northampton Pet April 28 Ord April 28

BRADSHAW, WILLIAM, Myerscough, nr Preston, Engine Tenter Preston Pet April 18 Ord April 18

BROUGHAM, WILFRID FRANCIS, Kensington, Solicitor High Court Pet Feb 3 Ord April 19

BROWN, J T, Ferme Park rd, Hornsey, Publican High Court Pet Feb 12 Ord April 19

BUCKLE, JOSEPH, Bicester, Oxford, Butcher Oxford Pet April 20 Ord April 20

CAVERLY, R B, Strand High Court Pet Feb 22 Ord April 19

CLEGG, JOHN, Shawforth, nr Rochdale, Stone Merchant Rochdale Pet April 19 Ord April 19

COLUMBINE, JOHN, Ilkeston, Derbys, Engineer Derby Pet April 19 Ord April 19

CONDICT, J ELLIOT, Broad st House, Company Promoter High Court Pet March 10 Ord April 18

CORAM, ARTHUR JOHN, Sutton, Guildford, Farmer Guildford Pet March 19 Pet April 19

DALBY, JOHN KIRBY, Market Harborough, Leicester, Pawnbroker Leicester Pet March 21 Ord April 18

DAVIES, ROBERT SAUNDERS, Penmaenmawr, Carnarvon, Watchmaker Bangor Pet April 20 Ord April 20

DAVIS, FREDERICK WILLIAM, Stoke, nr Grindleford, Derby, Electro Plate Manufacturer Sheffield Pet April 18 Ord April 18

EBBET, SARAH JANE, Cardiff, Draper Cardiff Pet April 19 Ord April 19

ELLIOTT, PERCY, Manchester sq, Musician High Court Pet April 18 Ord April 18

EVANS, JOHN, Bridgend, Glam, Hotel Proprietor Cardiff Pet April 16 Ord April 16

GARRATT, FREDERICK, Birmingham, Plumber Birmingham Pet April 19 Ord April 19

GRAHAM, FREDERICK, Ivybridge, Devon, China Dealer Plymouth Pet April 6 Ord April 18

HEWETSON, WILLIAM, Ireby, Cumbrid, Saddler Carlisle Pet April 19 Ord April 19

HOLDER, HENRY GEORGE, Leamington, Hotel Proprietor Warwick Pet April 15 Ord April 15
HUNTER, ARTHUR, Leicester, Tailor Leicester Pet March 31 Ord April 19
IZETT, JOSEPH THOMAS, Wolverhampton Wolverhampton Pet April 20 Ord April 20
JAMES, CHARLES EDWARD HALL, Greenwich Greenwich Pet April 18 Ord April 18
JAMES, GEORGE, jun, Hanley, Meat Salesman Hanley Pet March 18 Ord April 15
KENNA, JOHN, Leeds Leeds Pet April 18 Ord April 18
LEECH, JAMES, Ashton under Lyne Ashton under Lyne Pet April 1 Ord April 14
LOCKETT, TIMOTHY, Heeley, Sheffield Sheffield Pet April 20 Ord April 20
MIDDLEDITCH, BENJAMIN, Denston, Suffolk, Builder Cambridge Pet April 20 Ord April 20
NASH, HENRY WALTER, Shurdington, Glos Cheltenham Pet April 19 Ord April 19
NEVANAS, JOHN, Liverpool, Pawnbroker Liverpool Pet April 6 Ord April 19
PADFIELD, HENRY THOMAS, Frome, Somerset Frome Pet April 18 Ord April 18
SHERWIN, EDGAR, Coventry, Tailor Coventry Pet April 15 Ord April 15
STILLWELL, H J, East Ham, Essex, Builder High Court Pet April 6 Ord April 20
SWINDLEHURST, SAMUEL, Barrow in Furness, Hatter Ulverston Pet April 19 Ord April 19
SYKES, GEORGE, Birmingham, Pork Butcher Birmingham Pet April 18 Ord April 18
TIDEY, CHARLES WILLIAM, Aldershot, Eating house Keeper Guildford Pet April 19 Ord April 19
WALL, ROBERT, Swansea, Joiner Swansea Pet April 20 Ord April 20
WEST, EDMUND, Gt Grimsby Gt Grimsby Pet April 14 Ord April 14
WEST, THOMAS, Liverpool, Accountant High Court Pet April 19 Ord April 19
WHITE, JAMES, St Denys, Southampton, Manufacturing Ironmonger Southampton Pet April 18 Ord April 18
YOUNG, JAMES, Thornton le Beans, Yorks Northallerton Pet April 6 Ord April 18

Amended notice substituted for that published in the London Gazette of April 5:

DREWITT, FRANK GIBSON, Gosport, Hants, Cycle Maker Portsmouth Pet March 31 Ord March 31

RECEIVING ORDER RESCINDED.

CARBALLY, ANDREW, Liverpool, Team-owner's Runner Liverpool Rec Ord Jan 28, 1896 Resc April 19

FIRST MEETINGS.

CHANDLER, SAMUEL WILLIAM, Bisley, nr Stroud, Glos, Farm Bailiff May 3 at 11 Off Rec, Station rd, Gloucester
CONDICT, J ELLIOT, Broad st House, Company Promoter May 2 at 2.30 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
ELLIOTT, PERCY, Manchester sq, Musician May 2 at 11 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
FLETCHER, GEORGE, Long Eaton, Derbyshire, Innkeeper April 29 at 11 Off Rec, 40, St Mary's gate, Derby
FULLER, ARTHUR, Addlestone, Surrey, Butcher April 20 at 11.30 24, Railway app, London bdge
GARDNER, JOSEPH, Newcastle on Tyne, Wholesale Fancy Stationer May 2 at 11.30 Off Rec, 30, Mosley st, Newcastle on Tyne
GREAVES, JOHN, Chorley, Labourer May 6 at 2.30 Off Rec, 14, Chapel st, Preston
HIRST, HENRY, Liversedge, York April 29 at 3.30 Off Rec, Bank chmbrs, Batley
JONES, JOHN, Clydach, Glam, Farmer May 3 at 12 Off Rec, 31, Alexandra rd, Swansea
KEASL, WILLIAM, East Looe, Cornwall, Watchmaker April 29 at 11.30 6, Athenæum ter, Plymouth
MARSHALL, CHARLES WALKDEN, Oldham, Greengrocer April 29 at 9.30 Bank chmbrs, Queen st, Oldham
NORTHMORE, SOLOMON, Ugborough, Devon, Butcher April 29 at 11 6, Athenæum ter, Plymouth
PARRY, RICHARD VAUGHAN, Shrewsbury, Salop, Shopkeeper April 30 at 11.30 Off Rec, 42, St John's hill, Shrewsbury
PHILLIPS, THOMAS JAMES, Pembroke, Baker May 6 at 12.30 Temperance Hall, Pembroke Dock
PRICE, DAVID, Swansea, Milk Vendor April 30 at 12 Off Rec, 4, Queen st, Carmarthen
PROCTOR, CLARKE, Bethnal Green, Furniture Broker April 29 at 11 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
QUESTED, WILLIAM RICHARD, Stonebridge Park, London, Builder April 29 at 12 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
REGAN, WALTER SCOTT, Old Kent rd, Fish Frier April 29 at 2.30 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
RENNINGTON & HALLAM, Leicester, Boot Manufacturers April 29 at 12 30 Off Rec, 1, Berridge st, Leicester
SAYERS, CHARLES WILLIAM, Chingford, Builder April 29 at 3 Off Rec, 95, Temple chmbrs, Temple avenue
SCRUBBS, JOSEPH, and HARRY SCRUBBS, Leeds, Butchers May 2 at 11 Off Rec, 22, Park row, Leeds
SHERWIN, EDGAR, Coventry, Tailor May 2 at 12.30 Off Rec, 17, Hertford st, Coventry
TAYLOR, RANDOLPH COOPER, Hulme, Manchester, Beerseller April 29 at 2.30 Off Rec, Byrom st, Manchester
WAITE, RICHARD, Burnley, Grocer April 29 at 1 Exchange Hotel, Nicholas st, Burnley
WARD, WILLIAM, Rugby, Coachbuilder May 2 at 12 Off Rec, 17, Hertford st, Coventry
WEST, EDMUND, Gt Grimsby April 29 at 11 Off Rec, 15, Osborne st, Gt Grimsby
WHITE, JAMES, St Denys, Southampton, Manufacturing Ironmonger May 4 at 3 Off Rec, 172, High st, Southampton
WILTSHIRE, JAMES HENRY, Mountain Ash, Glam, Fruiterer April 29 at 3 65, High st, Merthyr Tydfil
WORSWICK, ALEXANDER JAMES, Hollinwood, nr Oldham, Builder April 29 at 10 Bank chmbrs, Queen st, Oldham

ADJUDICATIONS.

BALDRY, HENRY SHANNAN, Holt, Norfolk, Confectioner Norwich Pet April 18 Ord April 18
BARLOW, TOM, Briercliffe, Lancs, Clothier Burnley Pet April 15 Ord April 18
BENNS, WALTER BOWNESS, HENRY GEORGE CURRY, and JOHN BENNS, St Benet pl, Gracechurch st, Wholesale Stationers High Court Pet Feb 9 Ord April 19
BRADSHAW, WILLIAM, Myerscough, nr Preston, Engine Tenter Preston Pet April 18 Ord April 18
BUCKLE, JOSEPH, Bicester, Oxford, Butcher Oxford Pet April 20 Ord April 20
BURRILL, ROBERT, Fareham, Hants, Auctioneer Portsmouth Pet March 14 Ord April 14
CALDER, GEORGE JONES, East Dulwich, Public House Manager High Court Pet Feb 23 Ord April 19
CLEGG, JOHN, Shawforth, nr Rochdale, Stone Merchant Rochdale Pet April 18 Ord April 19
COLUMBINE, JOHN, Ilkeston, Derby, Engineer Derby Pet April 19 Ord April 19
CURRY, HENRY GEORGE, CHARLES EDWARD SIMPSON, and WILLIAM ALFRED CURRY, Brockley, Kent, Builders High Court Pet Feb 18 Ord April 19
DAVIES, ROBERT SAUNDERS, Penmaenmawr, Watchmaker Bangor Pet April 18 Ord April 20
DAVIS, FREDERICK WILLIAM, Sheffield, Electro plate Manufacturer Sheffield Pet April 18 Ord April 18
DUNDAS, GEORGE W, Jermyn st, St James's High Court Pet Dec 2 Ord April 18
ELLIOTT, PERCY, Manchester sq, Musician High Court Pet April 18 Ord April 18
EVANS, JOHN, Bridgend, Glam, Hotel Proprietor Cardiff Pet April 16 Ord April 16
FULLER, ARTHUR, Addlestone, Surrey, Butcher Kingston, Surrey Pet April 18 Ord April 18
GARRATT, FREDERICK, Birmingham, Plumber Birmingham Pet April 19 Ord April 19
GIBSON, WALTER, Old Broad st High Court Pet Feb 21 Ord April 16
HARRISON, THOMAS, Edith Weston Rectory, Rutland Leicester Pet March 28 Ord April 16
HARVEY, GEORGE, and JOHN HARVEY, Wellington, Salop, Coachbuilders Madeley Pet April 4 Ord April 18
HEWETSON, WILLIAM, Ireby, Cumberland, Saddler Carlisle Pet April 19 Ord April 19
HOLDER, HENRY GEORGE, Leamington, Hotel Proprietor Warwick Pet April 15 Ord April 15
IZETT, JOSEPH THOMAS, Wolverhampton Wolverhampton Pet April 19 Ord April 20
JAMES, CHARLES EDWARD HALL, Greenwich Greenwich Pet April 18 Ord April 18
KENNA, JOHN, Leeds Leeds Pet April 18 Ord April 18
LANDES, JEAN, and JOSEPH REICHTER, Manchester, Merchants Manchester Pet March 23 Ord April 18
LARGE, EDWARD, City rd, Finsbury sq, Valuer High Court Pet Jan 15 Ord April 18
LOCKETT, TIMOTHY, Heeley, Sheffield, Manfg Chemist Sheffield Pet April 20 Ord April 20
MCCULLUM, JOHN, Swansea, Grocer Swansea Pet March 11 Ord April 19
MIDDLEDITCH, BENJAMIN, Denston, Suffolk, Builder Cambridge Pet April 19 Ord April 20
MORITZ, LIONEL, Bury st, General Merchant High Court Pet March 31 Ord April 20
NASH, HENRY WALTER, Shurdington, Glos Cheltenham Pet April 19 Ord April 19
PADFIELD, HENRY THOMAS, Frome, Somersets Frome Pet April 18 Ord April 18
PARRY, RICHARD VAUGHAN, Nesscliffe, Salop, Shopkeeper Shrewsbury Pet April 13 Ord April 20
PHILLIPS, FANNY, High Holborn High Court Pet Feb 19 Ord April 16
SHEPHERD, THOMAS, Durham, Builder Durham Pet April 13 Ord April 18
SHERWIN, EDGAR, Coventry, Tailor Coventry Pet April 14 Ord April 16
SPOUSE, HENRIETTA, Margate, Kent, China Dealer Canterbury Pet March 3 Ord April 20
SWINDLEHURST, SAMUEL, Barrow in Furness, Hatter Ulverston Pet April 19 Ord April 19
SYKES, GEORGE, Birmingham, Pork Butcher Birmingham Pet April 18 Ord April 18
WALL, ROBERT, Swansea, Joiner Swansea Pet April 20 Ord April 20
WALTERS, JOHN, and JOHN JONES, Ogmore Vale, Glam, Builders Cardiff Pet April 4 Ord April 5
WEST, EDMUND, Great Grimsby Great Grimsby Pet April 14 Ord April 14
WEST, THOMAS, Liverpool, Accountant High Court Pet April 19 Ord April 19
WHITE, JAMES, St Denys, Southampton, Manufacturing Ironmonger Southampton Pet April 18 Ord April 18
WILLIAMS, FREDERICK, Coltishall, Norfolk, Ironmonger Norfolk Pet March 30 Ord April 19

Amended notice substituted for that published in the London Gazette of April 5:

DREWITT, FRANK GIBSON, Gosport, Hants, Cycle Maker Portsmouth Pet March 30 Ord March 31

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, April 26.

RECEIVING ORDERS.

ASHFORD, FRANCIS RICHARD, Bideford, Devon, Butcher Barnstaple Pet April 21 Ord April 22
ASHWIN, GERALD, Brockley, Kent, Solicitor's Clerk Greenwich Pet April 21 Ord April 21
CARSWELL, WILLIAM DAVID, Felling on Tyne, Durham, Travelling Jeweller Newcastle on Tyne Pet April 21 Ord April 21
COOK, WILLIAM, Maidstone, Fly Proprietor Maidstone Pet April 22 Ord April 23
COOPER, FRANK, Barnet, Corn Merchant Barnet Pet March 25 Ord April 20
ENGLAND, JOHN, Boroughbridge, Yorks, Saddler York Pet April 21 Ord April 21
FRANC, GUSTAV, Lombard st, Merchant High Court Pet Dec 31 Ord April 22
GIBB, DAVID, Limehouse, Builder High Court Pet March 19 Ord April 22
GLEDHILL, TOM, Burnley, Cabdriver Burnley Pet April 21 Ord April 21
GRIFFITHS, SARAH, Millom, Cumberland, Grocer Whitehaven Pet April 22 Ord April 22
HAMMOND, H ROSSI, Lincoln's inn fields, Solicitor High Court Pet March 2 Ord April 22
HANCOCK, WALTER, Biddulph, Stafford, Grocer Macclesfield Pet April 20 Ord April 20
HARTMONT, EDWARD HERZBERG, Lombard st, Merchant High Court Pet Jan 10 Ord April 1
HENNESSEY, E C, Baker st High Court Pet Feb 8 Ord April 22
HOLLOWAY, LEMUEL HOLMES, Birmingham, Carpenter Birmingham Pet April 21 Ord April 21
HOLMES, JAMES, Halifax, Roller Coverer Halifax Pet April 19 Ord April 22
HOLT, GRANGE OWEN, Nassau st, Regent st, Commercial Traveller High Court Pet April 21 Ord April 21
JONES, WILLIAM, Quarter Bach, Carmarthens, Butcher Carmarthen Pet April 20 Ord April 20
KENYON, JOSEPH, Bolton, Commercial Traveller Bolton Pet April 21 Ord April 21
LEECH, CHARLES JOHN FREDERICK, Burton on Trent, Hairdresser Burton on Trent Pet April 22 Ord April 22
LEWIS, JOHN BERTRAM, Liverpool, Provision Dealer Liverpool Pet April 22 Ord April 22
LITTLEWOOD, EDGAR ALBERT, Gt Yarmouth, General Dealer Gt Yarmouth Pet April 23 Ord April 23
MEADOWS, HENRY, Leicester, Boot Manufacturer Leicester Pet April 22 Ord April 22
PADDEN, ARTHUR WILLIAM, Luton, Straw Hat Manufacturer Luton Pet April 23 Ord April 23
PEREIRA, CHRISTOPHER CHARLES, Staines, Builder Kingston, Surrey Pet Nov 4 Ord April 21
RETALLACK, WILLIAM, Bayswater High Court Pet April 23 Ord April 23
RICHARDS, JOHN SAMUEL, Nottingham, Timekeeper Nottingham Pet April 22 Ord April 22
RICHELIEU, THOMAS, Darlington, Boiler Smith Leeds Pet April 21 Ord April 21
SANDERS, HAYDN, Rotherham, York, Advertising Contractor Sheffield Pet April 22 Ord April 22
SAYTHE, W H, North Kensington High Court Pet March 28 Ord April 21
SUTCLIFFE, ISHMAEL, Colne, Lancs, Licensed Victualler, Burnley Pet March 30 Ord April 21
SYMONDS, JOSIAH NORMAN, Horbury, Yorks, Draper Wakefield Pet April 23 Ord April 23
WADDINGTON, FREDERICK SYDNEY, Chiswick, Solicitor High Court Pet March 14 Ord April 21
WALLACE, CHARLES CLAUDE, East Molesey Kingston, Surrey Pet April 7 Ord April 21
WILLIAMS, JAMES, Barrow in Furness, Dock Gateman Ulverston Pet April 22 Ord April 22

Amended notice substituted for that published in the London Gazette of March 11:

ASTON, WILLIAM JOSEPH, Worcester, Builder Worcester Pet Feb 25 Ord March 8

Amended notice substituted for that published in the London Gazette of April 8:

BAMFORD, JOHN EDWARD, Wardle, nr Rochdale, Quilt Manufacturer Manchester Pet March 18 Ord April 6

ORDER RESCINDING RECEIVING ORDER.

DENNETT, THOMAS LAWRENCE, Hart st, Bloomsbury, Manager High Court Rec Ord Feb 23, 1898 Resc April 21

FIRST MEETINGS.

BAMFORD, JOHN EDWARD, Wardle, nr Rochdale, Quilt Manufacturer May 4 at 2.30 Off Rec, Byrom st, Manchester
BROUGHAM, WILFRED FRANCIS, Kensington, Solicitor May 3 at 12 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
BROWN, GEORGE FREDERICK, Rushden, Northamptons, Shoe Manufacturer May 4 at 12.30 Off Rec, County Court bldgs, Sheep st, Northampton
BROWN, JACOB, Cheltenham, Hawker May 5 at 4 County Court bldgs, Cheltenham
BROWN, J T, Hornsey, Publican May 3 at 2.30 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
CARTER, GEORGE, Stoke St Milborough, Salop, Machinist May 5 at 10 4, Corn sq, Leominster
COLUMBINE, JOHN, Ilkeston, Derbys, Engineer May 3 at 11 Off Rec, 40, St Mary's gate, Derby
DEAN, JOHN, Bradford, Manufacturer May 4 at 11 Off Rec, 31, Manor row, Bradford
EASTICK, WALTER, Gt Yarmouth May 3 at 10.30 Lovewell Blake, South Quay, Gt Yarmouth
EMERSON, J I., Aldershot May 3 at 11.30 24, Railway app, London bdge
ENGLAND, JOHN, Boroughbridge, Saddler May 6 at 12.15 Off Rec, 29, Stonegate, York
FAWTHELL, EDWARD, Linley, Salop, Farmer May 5 at 10 4, Corn sq, Leominster
GIBB, DAVID, Limehouse, Builder May 4 at 12 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
GRAHAM, FREDERICK, Ivybridge, Devon, China Dealer May 9 at 12 30 6, Athenæum ter, Plymouth
GWATKIN, EDWIN WILLIAM, Usk, Mon, Builder May 5 at 12 Off Rec, Westgate chmbrs, Newport, Mon
HAMMOND, H ROSSI, Lincoln's inn fields, Solicitor May 3 at 2.30 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
HARTMONT, EDWARD HERZBERG, Lombard st, Merchant May 3 at 12 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
HENNESSEY, E C, Baker st May 4 at 2.30 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
HEWETSON, WILLIAM, Ireby, Cumberland, Saddler May 9 at 12 Off Rec, 34, Fisher st, Carlisle
HITCHEN, HARRY, Aberdare, Painter May 3 at 2 65, High st, Merthyr Tydfil

HOLT, GRANGE OWEN, Nassau st, Regent st, Commercial Traveller May 3 at 11 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
HORWOOD, FREDERICK, Yardley, Worcester, Boot Maker May 5 at 11 174, Corporation st, Birmingham
JAMES, CHARLES EDWARD HALL, Greenwich May 3 at 12.30 24, Railway app, London Bridge
JENKINS, OLIVER, Cardiff, Grocer May 5 at 11 Off Rec, 29, Queen st, Cardiff
JONES, WILLIAM, Quarter Bach, Carmarthen, Butcher May 4 at 3 Off Rec, 4, Queen st, Carmarthen
KENNA, JOHN, Leeds May 4 at 11 Off Rec, 22, Park row, Leeds
KEYBURN, JOSEPH, Bolton, Commercial Traveller May 4 at 11 16, Wood st, Bolton
MEADOWS, HENRY, Leicester, Boot Manufacturer May 3 at 12.30 Off Rec, 1, Berridge st, Leicester
MIDDLEDITCH, BENJAMIN, Denston, Suffolk, Builder May 11 at 10 Off Rec, 5, Petty Cury, Cambridge
MOULD, ENOCH, JOSEPH ENOCH MOULD, BENJAMIN MOULD, JOSHUA MOULD, CALEB EPHRATAH MOULD, and ISAAC MOULD, Cheshire, Colliery Proprietors May 5 at 11 Off Rec, 23, King Edward st, Macclesfield
NASH, HENRY WALTER, Shurdington, Glos May 5 at 4.30 County Court bldgs, Cheltenham
PADFIELD, HENRY THOMAS, Frome, Somerset May 4 at 12 Off Rec, Baldwin st, Bristol
PLATNAUER, ALBERT LOUIS, and PERCY LOUIS PLATNAUER, Birmingham, Wholesale Jewellers May 6 at 11 174, Corporation st, Birmingham
PRYCE, HENRY CHARLES, Dowlais, Glam, Bootmaker May 4 at 12 65, High st, Merthyr Tydfil
RICHARDS, WILLIAM FRANK, Didsbury, Lancs, Plumber May 3 at 10.15 Off Rec, County chmbrs, Market pl, Stockport
SAMUELS, JOSEPH, Stratford, Tailor May 5 at 2.30 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
SHEPHERD, THOMAS, Durham, Builder May 3 at 1 Three Tuns Hotel, Durham
SMITH, THOMAS HENRY, Cardiff, Ironmonger May 5 at 11.30 Off Rec, 29, Queen st, Cardiff
STILLWELL, HENRY JAMES, East Ham, Essex, Builder May 5 at 11 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
THORP, CHARLES GLOVER, Nottingham, Physician May 3 at 11 Off Rec, 4, Castle pl, Park st, Nottingham
TAUSCOTT, ELIZABETH ALICE HARRIS, Wadebridge, Cornwall May 3 at 12 Off Rec, Boscawen st, Truro
WADDIE, ALFRED GORDON, Liverpool, American Cheese Importer May 4 at 2.30 Off Rec, 35, Victoria st, Liverpool
WAKEFIELD, HARRY, Chedworth, Glos, Farmer May 5 at 3.15 County Court bldgs, Cheltenham
WEEKS, EDWIN THOMAS, Plymouth, Confectioner May 9 at 12 6, Athenæum ter, Plymouth
WEST, THOMAS, Liverpool, Accountant May 6 at 2.30 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st

ADJUDICATIONS.

ADDINGLEY, SAMUEL, Knottingley, Yorks, Glass Bottle Manufacturer Wakefield Pet March 17 Ord April 21
ASHFORD, FRANCIS RICHARD, Bideford, Devons, Butcher Barnstaple Pet April 22 Ord April 22
ASHWIN, GERALD, Brockley, Kent, Solicitor's Clerk Greenwich Pet April 21 Ord April 21
BAYLY, GEORGE BRAGGE, West Brompton High Court Pet March 15 Ord April 22
BENBOW, GEORGE MORGAN, Llanidloes, Montgomery, Tailor Newtown Pet April 16 Ord April 21
BRAGG, ROBERT, Clapham Wandsworth Pet March 25 Ord April 21
BRICE, ELIJAH HENRY, Highbury, Cab Proprietor High Court Pet March 12 Ord April 22
CARSWELL, WILLIAM DAVID, Felling on Tyne, Durham, Travelling Jeweller Newcastle on Tyne Pet April 21 Ord April 21
ENGLAND, JOHN, Boroughbridge, Yorks, Saddler York Pet April 21 Ord April 21
GARDNER, DOUGLAS, and EDWARD BERTRAM HARTLEY, Birmingham, Engineers Birmingham Pet Feb 19 Ord April 22
GLEDHILL, TOM, Burnley, Cabdriver Burnley Pet April 21 Ord April 21
GLUCKSTEIN, SAMUEL MONTAGUE, Queen Victoria st, Journalist High Court Pet March 25 Ord April 20
GRAHAM, FREDERICK, Ivybridge, Devon, China Dealer Plymouth Pet March 30 Ord April 20
HANCOCK, WALTER, Biddulph, Staffs, Grocer Macclesfield Pet April 20 Ord April 20
HOBBINS, SAMUEL WASS, Stourton, Lincs, Farmer High Court Pet July 17 Ord April 22
HOLT, GRANGE OWEN, Nassau st, Regent st, Commercial Traveller High Court Pet April 21 Ord April 21
JONES, WILLIAM, Quarter Bach, Carmarthens, Butcher Carmarthen Pet April 20 Ord April 20
KEYBURN, JOSEPH, Bolton, Traveller Bolton Pet April 21 Ord April 21
LEECH, CHARLES JOHN FREDERICK, Burton on Trent, Hairdresser Burton on Treat Pet April 22 Ord April 22
LEFEVER, WALTER ALEXANDER, Hackney rd, Timber Merchant High Court Pet March 17 Ord April 23
LITTLEWOOD, EDGAR ALBERT, Great Yarmouth, General Dealer Great Yarmouth Pet April 23 Ord April 23
LORD, JAMES, Byfield, Northamptons, Butcher Northampton Pet April 6 Ord April 19
MEADOWS, HENRY, Leicester, Boot Manufacturer Leicester Pet April 22 Ord April 22
MORRIS, ELEANOR, South Shields, Saddler Newcastle on Tyne Pet March 17 Ord April 21
PLATNAUER, ALBERT LOUIS, and PERCY LOUIS PLATNAUER, Birmingham, Wholesale Jewellers Birmingham Pet April 6 Ord April 21
RICHARDS, JOHN SAMUEL, Nottingham, Timekeeper Nottingham Pet April 22 Ord April 22
RICHELIEU, THOMAS, Darlington, Journeyman Boiler Smith, Leeds Pet April 21 Ord April 21
RIDEAL, CHARLES FREDERICK, Victoria st, Publisher High Court Pet Jan 24 Ord April 22
SANDERS, HAYDN, Rotherham, Advertising Contractor Sheffield Pet April 22 Ord April 22
SMITH, THOMAS HENRY, Cardiff, Ironmonger Cardiff Pet April 12 Ord April 18
SPILLER, CHARLES HENRY, Bristol, Beerhouse Keeper Bristol Pet April 6 Ord April 22
STILLWELL, HENRY JAMES, East Ham, Builder High Court Pet April 6 Ord April 21
SYMONDS, JOSIAH NORMAN, Horbury, Yorks, Fancy Draper Wakefield Pet April 22 Ord April 23
WADDIE, ALFRED GORDON, Liverpool, American Cheese Importer Liverpool Pet March 22 Ord April 22
WILLIAMS, JAMES, Barrow in Furness, Dock Gateman Ulverston Pet April 22 Ord April 22
WOOD, JOHN SADLER, Coleman st, Chartered Accountant High Court Pet Feb 7 Ord April 21
YOUNG, JAMES, Thornton le Beans, Yorks Northallerton Pet April 6 Ord April 22

COMMON DISEASES.

4.—THE LIVER.

The liver is the largest organ in the body, and has multifarious duties to perform in the internal economy of the digestive system. After the stomach it is the most abused of all the digestive organs. It is inflamed and hardened by the abuse of alcohol, and its functions are hindered and impaired by the tannic acid, the outcome of tea-drinking. Errors in diet lead to a diminished secretion of bile. It becomes torpid and sluggish, and the defects react on the blood-current—deleterious products are carried into the circulation—the skin becomes muddy and yellow, the tongue furred. Life becomes a burden and the victim says "Life is not worth living." He flies to drugs, blue pill, and other quack nostrums, and finds a temporary relief, and a rebound to a state worse than before; destroys his digestion by nauseous medicines and liver pills and wonders why he continues dull, languid, cranky, and out of sorts. He never pauses to consider the why and the wherefore, but continues to either doctor himself, or is doctored by others, into a confirmed melancholy invalid, who invariably shuffles off the mortal coil of a miserable life through making his stomach a receptacle for all the so-called liver cures in the pharmacopœia.

There is only one method to maintain the liver in good working order, and that is attention to *Diet* and *Exercise*. Happy is the man or woman who does not know they have a liver! Unless this mighty organ duly performs its principal function of secreting bile, a whole army of troubles arise.

It cannot be done with medicine.

It can, however, be done with a perfect food beverage, such as Dr. Tibbles' Vi-Cocoa, which possesses exceptional vitalizing properties. It will save your digestion part of its work, and is far more nourishing and sustenant than tea or the ordinary cocoa, whilst it possesses a tonic and recuperative force possessed by neither.

Dr. Tibbles' Vi-Cocoa is pleasant and palatable, and embodying as it does the numerous principles contained in Malt, Hops, Kola, and Cocoa, it imparts nourishment and builds up strength. As a Food Beverage it is invaluable.

Dr. Tibbles' Vi-Cocoa can be obtained from all chemists, grocers, and stores, or from Dr. Tibbles' Vi-Cocoa, Limited, 60, 61, and 62, Bunhill-row, London, E.C.

As a test of its merit a dainty sample tin of Dr. Tibbles' Vi-Cocoa will be sent free on application to any address, if when writing (a postcard will do) the reader will name the SOLICITORS' JOURNAL.

EFFINGHAM WILSON,
11, ROYAL EXCHANGE, LONDON, E.C.

THE JUDICIAL TRUSTEES ACT, 1896, AND THE RULES MADE THEREUNDER.
Price 2s. 6d. net.
CATALOGUES GRATIS AND POST-FREE.

REEVES & TURNER,
LAW BOOKSELLERS AND PUBLISHERS.
Libraries Valued or Purchased.
A Large Stock of Second-hand Reports and Text-books always on Sale.
100, CHANCERY LANE & CAREY STREET.

Just published, price 5s. 6d. net.; postage 3d. extra.
A SUPPLEMENT
TO THE SECOND EDITION OF THE
"LAW OF COPYHOLDS AND CUSTOMARY TENURES OF LAND,"
CONTAINING THE
COPYHOLD ACT, 1894,
WITH
NOTES ON THE SECTIONS THEREOF AND AN ADDENDUM TO THE TREATISE.
BY
C. I. ELTON, Q.C.,
AND
H. J. H. MACKAY, Barrister-at-Law.
*** The work complete, with Supplement, 30s.; cash, 24s.
WILDY & SONS, Law Publishers,
LINCOLN'S-INN ARCHWAY, CAREY-STREET, LONDON, W.C.

LAW FIRE INSURANCE SOCIETY,
114, CHANCERY-LANE, LONDON,
April 12th, 1898.

NOTICE is HEREBY GIVEN that the ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING of the Shareholders of the LAW FIRE INSURANCE SOCIETY will be held at the SOCIETY'S HOUSE, CHANCERY LANE, on TUESDAY the 3rd day of MAY NEXT, to elect ten Directors in the room of the like number of Directors who go out by rotation; to elect four Auditors in the room of the like number who retire; and for general purposes.

The Chair will be taken at One o'clock precisely. The Accounts of the Society, with the Auditors' Report upon them, may be inspected by the Shareholders for 14 days previously to the Annual Meeting and during one month after it.

The following Directors retire by rotation, are eligible, and offer themselves for re-election:—
Sir William James Farrer.
William Dawes Freshfield, Esq
William Alexander Tooke Hallowes, Esq.
Lord Hobhouse.
Charles Plumptre Johnson, Esq.
Harry Wilmot Lee, Esq.
Sir Richard Nicholson.
Richard Pennington, Esq.
George Ernest Steward, Esq.
Edward Hugh Whitehead, Esq.

The Auditors retiring are:—
James Frederick Burton, Esq.
John Henry Hortin, Esq.
William Tanner Neve, Esq.
Charles Robert Roberts West, Esq.
who are eligible and offer themselves for re-election.

By order of the Board of Directors,
GEORGE WILLIAM BELL,
Secretary.

MR. CUTHBERT SPURLING, M.A., B.C.L. (Oxford), First Class Honours, late Scholar of Christ Church, continues to PREPARE for all Legal Examinations by Day, Evening, or Post.
LATEST SUCCESSES.—Bar Examination, 1897—44 sent up, 39 passed; June, 1897, LL.B. Cambridge gained by a pupil; Solicitors' Final, 2 in both passed.
Address, 11, New-court, Lincoln's-inn, W.C.

ME. BRANDRETH, 34, Rue d'Hauteville, Paris, has made special arrangements for carrying out the formalities prescribed under the New Regulations relating to Public Companies in France. Consultations in matters of Civil and Criminal Procedure after 4 daily during term.

LAW.—Wanted at once, Unadmitted Clerk capable of superintending litigation of large Colonial firm of solicitors; good salary and passage out.—Apply, stating age, experience, and salary required, to C. B., c/o Messrs. J. T. Segrue, Ltd., Gresham House, E.C.

LAW.—Experienced Managing Clerk (admitted) required in Solicitor's Office, accustomed to taking entire charge of general business, but with special acquaintance with Chancery practice.—Reply, stating previous engagements and salary asked, by letter to X. A., c/o Crossley, Moir, & Co., 57, Coleman-street, E.C.

TO SOLICITORS.—A Banker and Financier is prepared to receive financial details of any sound undertaking suitable for limited company; would purchase right out; liberal fee to solicitors for introducing business.—A. B., "Solicitors' Journal" Office.

TO SOLICITORS.—Required, Name and Address of Firm succeeding to the business of Chas. James Whalley, 6, Child's-place, Temple-bar, in 1859.—Box 59, "Solicitors' Journal" Office, 27, Chancery-lane.

SOLICITOR desirous of increasing his connection, would Purchase a Sound Practice or Succession in the City; could take over existing offices.—R. F., "Solicitors' Journal" Office, 27, Chancery-lane.

CLERK requires Situation to Assist in the various departments of a solicitor's office; age 23; 9 years' experience in solicitor's office; shorthand.—ARNOLD, 22, Foubert's-place, W.

WANTED, Clerkship in London Office doing Admiralty business, by Solicitor (January Final, not admitted, retained where articled in City office); has given close attention to office work; moderate salary.—Address, NAVIS, Wilkes' Advertising Offices, 29, Ludgate-hill.

WANTED in a solicitor's office, a Clerk with general experience.—Apply by letter, stating age, experience, and salary required, to X. Y. Z., Osmond & Co., Ironmonger-lane, E.C.

TO TRUSTEES and Others.—Advertiser, who has just completed the management and distribution of a considerable estate, largely realty, seeks a similar post; bankers' and professional references of the highest character.—Address, W. L., c/o Streets, 30, Cornhill.

THE SUBURBAN PROPERTIES CORPORATION, of 82, Finsbury-pavement, E.C., have the following Parcels of Freehold Ground-rents in the Suburbs of London for Disposal, at 28½ years' purchase—viz., £30 10s., £40, £44, £60 and £27, and £80 at 27 years' purchase.